DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 108 FL 010 123

AUTHOR Shaw, Willard David
TITLE Why Students Study English: A Trinational Study of Student Attitudes Towards English in Singapore, India, and Thailand.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 107p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Factors; *English (Second Language); English for Special Purposes; *Language Attitudes; Language Instruction; *Language Role; Language Skills; Language Standardization; *Language Usage; Native Speakers; *Official Languages; Second Language Learning; Social Dialects; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Student Needs; *Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS India; Singapore; Thailand

ABSTRACT

In accordance with the growing trend in language teaching philosophy towards assessing learner needs before choosing methods and materials, this study concentrates on the attitudes of final year bachelor degree program students towards learning and using English. These 821 students from Thailand, India, and Singapore were majoring in the fields of: (1) English language, literature and teaching; (2) engineering; and (3) commerce/business. A closed format type of questionnaire with 111 items was used. The general conclusions drawn in the major areas studied were: (1) although use of English was primarily for international purposes, some English was used for intranational purposes; (2) reasons for studying English and the skills preferred overwhelmingly indicated instrumental rather than integrative needs; (3) if these students are representative of other groups and countries, the future growth of English to meet the development of a world society and international market seems to be a certainty; (4) expansion of English will be further aided by decolonization and indigenization of English, as it becomes less a symbol of imperialism, and more a valid candidate for an international language and a local language for intranational purposes; and (5) English is being accepted as the country's own language with native varieties and teachers. Appendices include lists of cooperating institutions and the questionnaire with some tabulated results. (MHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MA Thesis

ED171108

WHY STUDENTS STUDY ENGLISH:

A TRINATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENTS' ATTITUDES

TOWARDS ENGLISH IN SINGAPORE, INDIA, AND THAILAND

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

AUGUST 1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Willard D. Shaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

Willard David Shaw

Thesis Committee

Richard Schmidt, Chairman
Mark Lester
Charles Mason

FL010123

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
READING ROOM
Department of English
as a Second Language

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In a study that has involved almost a thousand people and eighteen institutions, it is difficult to single out individuals for special recognition without the risk of accidentally slighting someone who played an equally important role. However, there are six people whose cooperation was far above the call of duty and I am compelled to mention them. Mr. L.B. Despande, Registrar of the Central Institute of English, Hyderabad, India and Dr. Panninee Sagarik of the English Lanuguage Center of Chulalongkorn Univeristy, Bangkok, Thailand made most of the actual arrangements for gathering respondents in those two countries. Mrs. Mayuri Sukwiwat of the Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center gave considerable support to the project and thus ensured its success in her homeland, Thailand. Dr. Achara Wangsotorn of the Central Institute of English, Bangkok did an outstanding job of translating the questionnaire into Thai. Two chief librarians, Mr. L.S. Ramaiah of C.I.E.F.L., Hyderabad and Ms. Yolanda Beh of the Regional Language Centre, Singapore provided me with highly professional help and invaluable cooperation.

Finally I would like to thank the two groups that made this field research and manuscript possible: the Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center who funded the project and the participating students, teachers, and administrators of all the institutions listed in Appendix A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii

LIST OF TABLES..... v

PREFACE.....vi

CHAPTER I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY..... 1

CHAPTER II. THE COUNTRIES AND THE STUDENTS.....16

CHAPTER III. WHY WE STUDIED ENGLISH.....27

CHAPTER IV. WHO WE USE ENGLISH WITH.....43

CHAPTER V. WHAT WE WANT TO LEARN.....51

CHAPTER VI. WHAT WE FEEL ABOUT ENGLISH.....63

CHAPTER VII. SOME CONCLUSIONS.....81

APPENDIX A A LIST OF THE COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS.....85

APPENDIX B REASONS FOR STUDYING ENGLISH.....87

APPENDIX C THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS...89

APPENDIX D THE QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION).....90

BIBLIOGRAPHY 98

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Three Most Important Reasons For Studying English	41
II	Frequency of Use of English at Present	44
III	The Use of English in the Future	48
IV	The Ranking of the Four Skills	52
V	The Skill I Want to be My Best	53
VI	Division of Class Time Among the Four Skills	60
VII	Division of Class Time (Skills, Culture, Literature)	61
VIII	Variety of English Presently Spoken in Country	74
IX	Variety We Should Learn To Speak	78
X	Percentages of Students Choosing Native and Non-native Standards	79

PREFACE

This research project had its beginnings when I asked myself the question, "What am I doing here?" I asked it not as a philosophical inquiry into my existence as a human being but as a practical question concerning my status as a graduate student in the Department of English as a Second Language. My colleagues and I were taking specialized training so that we could work in English language programs at home and overseas. After a year and a half of intensive study of grammar, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and other academic areas, I realized that although I was coming to know my job quite well, I really had no clear idea of the attitudes of the people who would become my students. Did they really need the English language and native speaking teachers? If so, why? What types of skills did they want to develop? These and many other questions flooded my mind. The following pages recount my attempt to satisfy my curiosity and find the answers to these questions.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

"If English is indeed the principle language of international communication, it is only the latest in a series of languages to hold this position...If anything is clear from the history of international communication, it is that once a language has established itself as predominant in the world it will eventually fall from that perch. There is no reason to suppose, moreover, that this will not happen to English as well."

Richard Noss
(Noss 1967)

In the distant future, most people in the world will know English.

Agree: 609 Neutral: 153 Disagree: 59

821 students in Singapore, India, and Thailand, 1978

"We have imbibed our ideas of freedom and democracy through this language...English has been like the Prince coming from the West, whose magic touch had roused the Sleeping Beauty of the East- India- to a new life of hope and promise."

Niranjan Niyogi
(Niyogi 1965)

The Problem:

At this point in world history, English is the preeminent language of wider communication. In addition to its 275,000,000 native speakers, there are millions of others who speak it as a second or foreign language. Gage and Ohanessian (1974) estimated that there were over 115,000,000 people enrolled in English language programs in the one hundred and six countries they surveyed. English is used as a library language, as the medium of science and technology, as a contact language between nations and parts of nations, and as the language of media and modernity. It is also seen as a vestige of British colonialism and as an arm of American cultural imperialism. English is all of these things and more.

At the pedagogical level we see millions of aspiring English speakers. Thousands of teachers are being trained to help them; millions of dollars are being spent on materials for their classes; and billions of hours are expended yearly in the quest for English fluency. What I propose to do is to examine a small segment of this interest in and demand for English. Specifically I intend to look at the needs for English among final year bachelor degree students majoring in the fields of English, engineering, and commerce/business in the nations of Singapore, India, and Thailand.

The growing trend in language teaching philosophy today is towards looking first at the learner rather than the method or materials in order to discover his psychological and pragmatic needs. Meeting both of these needs is viewed as a prerequisite for successful language teaching and learning. In order to gain some insights into the needs of foreign students and the role of English in Asia today, I undertook this study seeking answers to these basic questions:

1. Why do students study English?
2. With whom are they now using English and with whom do they plan to use it in the future?
3. What language skills do they wish to develop?
4. What are their opinions regarding the English language, target varieties, and the future of English as a world language?

The above questions represent the basic broad areas on which I focused. I was especially interested in looking at the answers to these questions in terms of the differences and similarities that might exist: 1) between students in countries that have different uses for English; and 2) between students in different fields of study. This thesis will examine the country by country data. The second set of data will be used for a series of articles to be sent to the cooperating institutions and journals in the countries involved.

The particular aspects of these questions that I wish to examine are as follows:

Reasons: As precisely as I can, I hope to identify the specific reasons why these students study English. I am interested in determining if their responses show a preference for the use of English as an intranational language for social/economic purposes in their own country, as an international language for worldwide communication, or as a foreign language for interaction primarily with native speakers. I would also like to see how their pattern of reasons relates to Gardner and Lambert's theory of instrumental and integrative motivations.

Skills: Before syllabi and materials are prepared or adapted, it is vitally important to know exactly what the students want to learn. Are they more interested in reading, writing, speaking, or listening? What specific applications of these skills are most important? For example, do they wish to improve their reading so that they can read English literature, letters, or professionally related materials?

Language Use: With whom is the student presently using English? I am primarily interested in finding out the frequency of use of English with certain categories of people (e.g. family, teachers, etc.) and various groups of speakers (e.g. native and non-native speakers). I am also interested in their future expectations regarding the use of English with these same categories of people. Will they predict increases or decreases in frequency of use with these people?

Varieties of English: Until recently a close approximation to a native speaker standard was the theoretical goal of most language programs and language learners. Although in reality it was recognized as an almost impossible goal, most students and teachers held to the idea that one had to strive for native-like fluency. With the development and recognition of local varieties of English in a number of countries (e.g. India, the Philippines, etc.) some educators have asked that this impractical goal be dropped and that students be allowed to strive to reach a more realizable goal - that of an educated speaker of English of their own nationality (Kachru 1976, 1977, Lester 1976, Smith 1976). The British have been in the vanguard of this movement. Clifford Prator (Prator 1968), among others, has been strongly opposed to it. I am interested in seeing

if students recognize the existence of a local variety of English and if they wish to see it taught in their schools. If a foreign standard is preferred, I want to know which one it is.

Culture: Are students interested in English simply as a linguistic code or do they also want to learn about native speaker literature and culture? This may also be related to the social milieu in which students plan to use English. People who wish to use English as an indigenous contact language may be less interested in native speaker cultures than the person who plans to travel to those countries or to deal extensively with Westerners.

Justification:

The information collected and presented here should be of interest to those who are involved in teaching English and developing materials. Both of these tasks can be made easier and more certain of success if the students' views on these matters are known. The identification of the skills desired will be useful in this regard but is not enough. Perhaps a teacher or a book will be more successful if the reasons behind those desires are known. An understanding of the need for English as perceived by the students themselves should be extremely valuable in formulating meaningful materials and effective teaching strategies. The data collected on varieties of English and the mixing of language and culture will be useful in as far as it sheds light on the larger problems of selecting a standard, the culture-specificity of any language, and the future of English as a world language.

Description of the Study:

Type: This is a synchronic cross-national study. The data was gathered by means of a direct closed format type questionnaire with one hundred and eleven items. Most items required the respondent to make a choice from a one to five semantic differential scale. A closed format was used rather than an open-ended one because of the difficulty of quantifying open-ended responses and because it was deemed more efficient and thorough to present the students with extensive lists of reasons, skills, etc. and ask them to judge those items rather than to ask the respondents to conjure up all the many possibilities themselves in the limited time available. The topics studied were considered to generally be low emotion subjects amenable to this type of questionnaire. The nature of the topics plus the anonymity of the respondents probably favored truthful responses. A questionnaire was favored over such other research methods such as a matched guise, etc. because of the wide range of topics surveyed in the study.

Subjects: The subjects were final year bachelor degree students in the fields of: 1) English language, literature, or teaching; 2) engineering; and 3) business/commerce. These groups were selected because of the diverse views they might be expected to have towards English. A future analysis of the data will be made in terms of these academic groups rather than national groups. Since this was a trinational study, consideration was also made of the availability of subjects in these fields in these countries.

Final year students were selected because they were more likely to: 1) have developed opinions on their need for English; 2) have made career

choices; 3) be able to answer a questionnaire of the necessary complexity that was written in English. However, because several English language educators in Thailand strongly argued that an English language questionnaire would be too difficult for their students, a Thai translation was produced with the aid of the Central Institute of English in Bangkok and the English Language Center of Chulalongkorn University. Some slight differences in the questions were unavoidable but on the whole the translation was felt to be a good one by a number of Thai educators. In some cases the Thai version was even an improvement over the English version.

Reference is made to final year students rather than fourth year students because some departments had three or five year programs. The subjects were selected from a number of universities and colleges with a cosmopolitan cross-section of students representative of the student population as a whole. Equal numbers of students from each department were sought but this did not prove possible. Over 825 students participated in the study. There were 170 from Singapore, 342 from India, and 313 from Thailand.

Review of Relevant Research:

There is not much literature dealing directly with the range of questions asked in this thesis. A lot of work has been done on attitudes but it has generally taken a quite different approach. The main focus of this research has been on the following areas:

1. Attitudes of the learner toward the target language group. The most notable work in this area has been done by Gardner and Lambert (1972) among French and English Canadians.
2. Attitudes of people towards various language varieties and

dialects. Cohen (1974) studied Mexican-American judgements of English and Spanish; Fraser (1973) studied reactions to American dialects; Ryan (1973) studied reactions to accented speech.

3. Attitudes of teachers and parents towards foreign language study (Ackerman 1972, Papila 1973, Feenstra 1969, Savignon 1976, de Garcia 1976).
4. Attitudes of American students towards the study of foreign languages (Reinert 1970).
5. The relation of attitudes to achievement. Macnamara (1973) holds that attitudes are a minor factor. However, the vast majority of studies attach great importance to the role of attitudes (Spolsky 1969, Gardner et. al. 1972, 1975, 1976). Savignon (1976) even considers it to be the most important factor in second language learning.

That there is not much written along the lines of this present study is probably due to the fact that this research deals with three areas which investigators usually keep fairly separate: attitudes, motivations, and language use. It may also be because such studies are more likely to be done by governments for in-country use only and not for publication. In addition, much of the work has been done with Mexican-American, French-Canadian, and English-Canadian groups. These situations are much different from those in this study in that most deal with two language groups living side by side. In the Asian context there are no large bodies of native speakers to integrate with. Since most of the material in these areas is of only marginal interest, I will confine my remarks to those studies which are directly relevant.

The major work done on attitudes and motivations is the body of material produced by Wallace Lambert and Robert Gardner and their associates. More than any other people they have established the importance of attitudes and motivation is second language learning. Their initial studies showed that students who were oriented towards learning a second language in order to communicate with that language group tended to have more favorable attitudes towards that group and that this resulted in a greater effort to acquire the target language. They concluded that these motivational variables were as highly related to second language achievement as were the indices of language aptitude. They labeled this type of motivation "integrative" as opposed to "instrumental" type motives which were strictly utilitarian.

In their research, Gardner and Lambert were interested more in identifying these broad types of motives than in discovering the specific reasons why students were learning the target language. The bicultural contexts in which they did most of their research also makes it less applicable to my work. However, they did do a companion study in the Philippines. The results showed that students with an instrumental outlook who received parental support for their study of English were successful in developing proficiency in the language. However, for a subgroup of students an integrative orientation had a great effect on proficiency - especially the oral-aural skills. They concluded that in a country where English is an imported world language and national language, both instrumental and integrative motivations must be cultivated (Gardner and Lambert 1972). An earlier study (Santos 1968) had produced the same results.

However, the researcher concluded that whatever integrative motivation that existed was directed towards an English speaking Filipino group and not towards a native speaking group.

In India, Lukmani (1972) did similar research with 60 high school girls and concluded that in their case instrumental motivation was more highly related to English proficiency than integrative motives. Their proficiency came from a desire to use English as a tool with which to cope with the demands of modern life and not as a means of entry into a reference group such as native English speakers or English speaking Indians. Given the small homogeneous sampling made, one is hesitant to generalize that this is the case in India. Also, in devising her own set of instrumental and integrative reasons, she was not careful enough in making them unambiguous. Therefore some of her data is suspect.

None of these studies has really tried to isolate the specific reasons why students in Asian countries study English. Harrison (1975) did this for Jordan and found that the main reason was to enable students to get a job outside the country. Although in Jordan's case teachers and administrators might hesitate to recognize and encourage that type of motivation, in most cases language programs could be made stronger if they were more in tune with the students' real needs (Joiner 1974, Lipton 1972).

The most relevant study on the skills that students desire to develop was found in an unpublished paper by Lyle Bachman (1975) reporting the results of a study done with college administrators, teachers, and students in Thailand. Fifty-six percent of the undergraduates contacted felt that students should gain proficiency in all four language skills, 12% favored listening and speaking, 9% favored listening and reading, and 9% favored

reading and writing. When rating a number of skills as objectives for learning English at the college level, students assigned the highest importance to:

1. conducting independent study in their area of specialty.
2. understanding lectures in English.
3. reading textbooks and journals in their fields.
4. reading and understanding general English.
5. conversing with foreign lecturers.
6. continuing their education in English speaking countries.

Bachman's study confined itself to the uses of English in the academic world of the student. No information is provided on the size or nature of the study.

A number of unpublished papers on the position of English in Singapore, India, and Thailand were useful in designing the research presented here. The most up-to-date and personal ones were those contained in the ESL State of the Art papers written by Asian EFL/ESL teachers and program administrators for the Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center (Smith 1970-75). The papers give a brief overview of the status of English in certain Asian countries. Other surveys include Hayden (1967), Noss (1967), Watson and Nababan (1974) and Lee (1976). Each has a discussion on the language situations in Thailand and Singapore. Gopinathan (1974), Hassan (1976), and Crewe (1977) are collections of articles on the educational, social, and linguistic conditions prevailing in Singapore. Kuo (1974, 1976) presents the facts and figures on the growth of a bilingual state. He predicts that English will soon become the most widely spread language among Singaporeans. Platt (1975) describes the dialects spoken

there while Tongue (1974) analyzes the English used by educated speakers in Singapore and Malaysia. Some aspects of the Thai situation are presented in articles by Anderson (1970), Brown (1976), Brudiprabha (1976), Debyasuvarn (1978), and Wangsotorn (1976). The general English language situation in India is documented in papers by Kachru (1969, 1976, 1977), Kubchandani (1976) and the Ministry of Education (1967, 1968, 1971). Arguments for and against the retention of English as an official language are discussed in Desai (1956), Niyogi (1965), and Narayan (1970). A wealth of statistics detailing the status of English as well as many of the indigenous languages can be found in books by the Central Institute of Indian Languages (1971), Nigam (1972), and Chaturvedi (1976).

The final topic area of relevance is the larger question of the role of English in non-native speaking countries. As argued in articles by Prator (1968) and Kachru (1976, 1977), the question is one of which standard to follow and how to maintain mutual intelligibility among various dialects of English. Prator opposes the acceptance of local national varieties of English as standards for instruction. Kachru rebuts his criticisms and argues that English now belongs to the world and not only to the native speakers. The users have the right to adapt English to their own needs. This may mean that a number of standards may develop even within the same country depending on the groups with whom it will be eventually used. Kachru (1976) also reports on a survey of graduate students which showed a preference of 66.6% for following the British model as the goal for English programs. Only 5% preferred American English, while 22% preferred Indian English. Fifty-six per cent of those students, however, labeled their own spoken variety of English as Indian English, 29% as British English, and 3% as American English.

Agreeing in substance with what Kachru says are two papers by Lester (1976) and Smith (1976), both entitled "English as an International Auxiliary Language". They suggest that the EIAL outlook is more realistic than the old ESL/EFL framework. They see English as being used on a number of different levels: 1) as a reading or research language; 2) as an auxiliary language within a country; 3) as an international language; 4) as a native language. They envision a number of standards depending on the level at which English will be used. Both discuss the pedagogical implications of such an event.

Smith and Lester also tackle the question of the role of culture in language teaching. Sommer (1974) believes that it is important to teach culture along with the language because it increases motivation and helps the student develop a positive attitude toward the target group. Lester and Smith would probably agree. However, they would question whether it is the native speaker's culture which has to be taught. If English is to be used as an auxiliary language within a country, it would be more realistic to teach it in terms of the local culture.

Pre-Testing of the Instrument:

The questionnaire was given to thirty students in two ELI classes at the University of Hawaii and to some volunteers from the Hawaii English Language Program. The students ranged in age from 16 to 30 and were from seven different countries and many fields of study. This situation was not very similar to the actual field conditions, but testing did serve to verify that the test could be done in a class period. Times ranged from 20-60 minutes. Students doing it outside of class generally reported spending more time on it than those who did it in class. They

reported very few problems of comprehension of the material. The difficulties they encountered were primarily caused by the concepts stated and not by the language itself. The questionnaire was shown to educators from Thailand and India. Based on the feedback received from these students and teachers the questionnaire was revised. Several changes were also made to increase the ease of tabulation of the results.

Procedure:

The instrument was administered in a variety of ways depending on the policies of the cooperating institutions. Some were done in class under the supervision of the researcher or a teacher resulting in a one hundred percent completion rate. Others were handed out to be done on the students' own time at home. The percentage of return naturally fluctuated with this latter group.

Sampling Locations:

The sampling took place in three large cities in three countries: 1) Singapore, Republic of Singapore; 2) Hyderabad, India; 3) Bangkok, Thailand. The English language situation prevailing in each of these countries is discussed in the next chapter. A list of the cooperating institutions in each of the countries is in Appendix A.

Data Preparation and Method of Analysis:

All of the information on the questionnaires other than spontaneous comments was placed on data cards and a computer analysis using the SPSS program was run. This analysis produced the means, median, standard error, standard deviation, etc. in addition to a frequency table for the responses to each item. Computer time and the assistance of a computer

expert were supplied by the Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center.

The Discussion:

Throughout the ensuing discussion of the data I will refer to the three groups by nationality. This is merely for convenience sake and does not mean that I am proposing that this data describes the attitudes of entire nations. It does, however, give an accurate description of the views of the target groups in the cities surveyed.

CHAPTER II

THE COUNTRIES AND THE STUDENTS

"343.1 The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in the Devanagri script.

"2. Notwithstanding anything in Clause 1, for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement.

"3. Parliament may by law provide for the use after said fifteen years, of the English language."

The Constitution of India
(Abraham 1977)

"7.1 Malay, Mandarin, Tamil and English shall be the four official languages of Singapore."

The Republic of Singapore
Independence Act of 1965
(Kuo 1974)

"5.1 In principle in the elementary level all pupils must study the Thai language and other life skills so that they will become united and can communicate with one another. In the required course of twenty-five hours, foreign languages are not offered, but the teaching of foreign languages in addition to the required curriculum could be allowed where appropriate.

"5.2.1 Therefore private schools which are capable of teaching English from first to fourth grade should be allowed to offer English courses.

"5.2 At present the English language has become a part of the daily life of the people, especially in urban areas. Therefore the English language is offered as one of the subjects from the fifth/sixth grade. English is also an international language which is the means for information and knowledge of the Thai people."

National Education Policy
Thailand, 1977
(Ministry of Education 1977)

In order to understand the data which is presented in subsequent chapters, it is essential to first know something about the English language situations in the three countries surveyed. This knowledge will be very helpful in the interpretation of the responses and in accounting for similarities and differences that might arise between these countries.

Singapore:

Singapore is a city state of about 2,300,000 people situated on the southern extreme of the Malay peninsula. It is a multicultural country composed primarily of people of Chinese (70%), Malay (15%), and Indian (7%) ancestry. Singapore's language policy reflects this multiethnic make-up. There are four official languages. Mandarin, Tamil, and Malay represent the three great cultural traditions extant in Singapore while English represents its colonial heritage and its technological future. In the educational system instruction is available in all four official languages from the primary through the secondary grades. At the tertiary level English is the only medium of instruction. Previously Nanyang University was a Chinese medium institution, but it changed to English after 1975.

The Government of Singapore pursues a bilingual policy that requires the learning of English plus one of the other official languages. This causes problems for some students of Indian and Chinese origin who speak a language other than Mandarin or Tamil at home. For instance, the largest group of speakers in Singapore are those using the Hokkien dialect of Chinese. Thus for a large number of students, the "mother tongue" studied in school or used as a medium of instruction is often a second language for them and not their actual native language. In addition to that language they must also learn English.

In Singaporean society at large English has an important role to play. It is the language of the government bureaucracy, the laws and the courts, tourism, technology, and business. Singapore has the highest per capita income of any country in South or Southeast Asia. It is rapidly moving into higher technology areas of manufacturing and shipbuilding and desires to become the center of international business and banking in that part of Asia. In order to make use of Western technology and to attract Western capital, it is felt that English is necessary. English is also seen as the mortar which will help cement the three ethnic groups into a single community with a distinctly Singaporean identity. In a 1971 study, students from the English stream received the highest ratings for cultural and linguistic tolerance while the Chinese stream received the lowest (Kuo 1976).

At the same time, however, many Singaporeans are wary that the spread of English will lead to a deculturalization of their society. While opening the door to modern technology and skills, they fear that English will also transmit Western values that may conflict with traditional cultural values (Kuo 1976). It is hoped that the promotion of the three "mother tongues" in the school system will reinforce local cultural traditions and inhibit the spread of the undesired effects of Westernization and industrialization.

Meanwhile the use of English continues to grow. Under the Bilingual Policy both Mandarin and English have made strong advances in terms of the numbers of speakers of each language; but while the spread of Mandarin has primarily been through the Chinese community, English has been popular with every ethnic group. In 1947, 31.6% of primary and secondary students were enrolled in English stream schools as opposed to

over 58% in the Chinese stream. By 1967 the positions had reversed with 58.9% in the English stream and only 33.8% in Chinese medium schools (Kuo 1976). The figures for 1977 enrollment in primary schools showed that over 82% of the children were being placed in English medium schools (Kuo 1978, personal communication). Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew interpreted this movement as meaning that "parents have continued to place the future careers of their children before any cultural or linguistic patriotism" (Gopinathan 1975:59).

In 1975, 56% of the Singaporeans surveyed said that they could understand English. Younger people were more likely to know English than older adults (Kuo 1976). If its present rate of growth among all ethnic groups continues, it is probable that English will soon become the dominant language of Singapore for intranational as well as international purposes.

India:

Whenever the terms multicultural or multilingual are used, someone invariably brings up the example of India. A nation of 623,000,000 people of various religions and ethnicities, it is almost impossible to label any one thing as being representative of all of India. In the 1961 census, over 1600 mother tongues were reported in use in India (Central Institute of Indian Languages 1971). Although many linguists agree that this is a highly inflated figure, no one argues with the fact that India is one of the more linguistically heterogenous countries in the world. In addition to a very large number of indigenous languages, India also lays claim to having one of the world's largest English speaking populations. In the early 1970s it was estimated that there were almost

18,000,000 students enrolled in English classes in India (Gage and Ohanessian 1974).

The 1950 Constitution of India proclaimed Hindi as the official language of the Indian Union with English as an associate official language until 1965. The establishment of Hindi was a victory for the northern Hindi speaking states over the southern Dravidian language speaking states who wished to keep English as the official language. The vote for Hindi succeeded in Parliament by only one vote.

During the working out of a compromise, both groups agreed to continue with the use of English until 1965 when the situation would be reassessed. In 1967 an amendment was added to the Official Languages Act of 1963 which stated that "the use of both Hindi and English for specific official purposes shall remain in force until resolutions for the discontinuance of the use of the English language...have been passed by the Legislatures of all the states which have not adopted Hindi as their official language" (Abraham 1977). Since Hindi is not the official language of 15 state governments, it is not probable that all these states will agree to the abandonment of English for many years to come.

At the present time India continues to follow the Three Language Formula which was accepted by all the states in 1961. Under this plan students in the Hindi speaking states would study a modern Indian language, preferably one of the southern languages, in addition to Hindi and English. In the south it was hoped that schools would teach the local language plus Hindi and English (Ministry of Education 1967). In both cases English was to be the third language in order of importance. In practice, however, in both areas English received the second greatest amount of

emphasis after the mother tongue. Hindi has been growing in influence but it is doubtful if it will soon be popular enough to displace English from its associate language status.

One of the South's major arguments for the continued use of English as an official language is the same as one used by the Government of Singapore. Because English is not an indigenous language, it can serve as a neutral medium for communication and competition between the local language groups. No single group of native speakers gains an important advantage by having its language used exclusively for national civil service tests, government documents, courts of law, etc. All groups in the country must struggle equally to gain fluency in the neutral language.

The state of Andhra Pradesh lies geographically between the radicals of both extremes. It had a population of 35,934,898 in 1961, Telegu, a Dravidian language, is the mother tongue of almost 86% of the people. The next most widely spoken mother tongue is Urdu with 2,553,753 speakers. Hindi has the eighth largest number of native speakers (Central Institute of Indian Languages 1971). For years much of Andhra Pradesh was part of the Muslim kingdom of Hyderabad ruled by an Urdu speaking Nizam. At that time the medium of instruction at the state's largest tertiary institution, Osmania University, was Urdu. It is interesting to note that the new medium of instruction later adopted was English and not Hindi, although the latter is very similar to Urdu in its spoken form. Under the present system, the University enrolls mostly graduate students. Undergraduate education is carried out by a number of affiliated colleges some of which offer courses in Telegu.

English is a required language from fifth grade through the first year or two of college. Although it has the status of a third language

behind the mother tongue and Hindi, more time is actually given to English than to Hindi. For the secondary school leaving certificate, a higher passing grade is required for English than for Hindi (Chaturvedi 1976). It is obvious that in Andhra Pradesh Hindi is more important than English only on paper and not in the classroom.

Hyderabad is the capital of Andhra Pradesh and is the fifth largest city in India. It has a population of over 2,000,000 people. Its university and colleges attract students from all over the state as well as from outside the state. Respondents for the present study were drawn from Osmania University and five colleges in the city.

Thailand:

Thailand is a nation of 44,000,000 people. Its populace is much more homogenous than those of India and Singapore. Over 80% speak one of the four main Thai dialects as their mother tongue. The vast majority are Buddhist and are of the same racial group. Unlike India and Singapore, Thailand was able to escape the fate of colonization even though all of its neighbors eventually fell under the control of either the British or the French.

Whereas the arrival of English signaled the decline of many kingdoms in Asia, in Thailand English was imported at the behest of a king. King Mongkut, who ruled Thailand from 1851 to 1868, learned English from American missionaries and later hired private English tutors for his own children thus bringing status to the language and providing the story line for the famous musical, "The King and I". Successive generations of the royal family continued to learn English and its study gradually spread to the middle class. By 1911 a knowledge of English had become the status symbol of the modern educated person. In 1913 it became a

compulsory subject from the fourth grade on. In 1932 it was made compulsory from the fifth grade onwards (Debyasuvarn 1978). That is its present position in the educational system although some educators are trying very hard to persuade the government to have it made into an optional subject.

The Students:

The respondents were final year college students from a total of twelve universities and colleges in the three countries. A list of all the cooperating institutions is included in the appendix. Despite variations in the position of English in the respective educational systems, the average number of years of English study was about the same. The Singaporeans led with 14.2 years while the Indians and the Thais were very close with 13.7 and 13.5 years respectively. Greater differences were seen in the percentages of students who had attended high schools and colleges where English was the main medium of instruction. The Singaporeans and Indians were very similar in this aspect of their background. Sixty-four percent of the Singaporeans and sixty-seven percent of the Indians reported attending English medium high schools. For college the percentages were ninety-eight percent for Singapore and ninety-four percent for Hyderabad.

The Thai group presented a much different picture. Less than 2% reported attending high schools where English was a major medium of instruction. Over 5% said that they were attending a college or university where English was the main language. Most of these people were majoring in English and were receiving much of their instruction in English. There are no English medium colleges or universities in Thailand.

Responses to questions concerning their personal English language background revealed almost the same pattern of differences. The Singaporeans led the way in claiming that English was used at home when they were children. Over 51% made that claim. A high percentage of Indians (38.3%) also replied in the affirmative. Less than 3% of the Thais reported the use of English in their homes. The same divisions appeared when the three groups listed the first language they learned to speak and the language they now know the best. Over 18% of the Singaporeans and 6.5% of the Indians said that English was the first language they learned. There may have been some confusion here over the use of the word "learned". Some respondents may have felt that the word implied a formal school setting and that they had "acquired" their mother tongue while English was the first language they had actually studied. In any case, the figures do indicate that there may be some near-native speakers in the sampling. When asked to estimate the percentage of time English was used in their homes when they were children, forty Singaporeans (23.5%) guessed that English was used at least 50% of the time. Eleven (3.6%) of them said it was used at least 90% of the time. Forty-six Indians (6.7%) said English was used 50% of the time and nine (2.1%) thought it had been used at least 90% of the time. When asked to pick the language they now knew the best, 59% of the Singaporeans and over 46% of the Indians picked English. These percentages seem high and some people may have misinterpreted the question in some way. Once again, however, these seemingly high figures do indicate something about the general language situations in those countries. Many students in Singapore and India do have an excellent command of English and use it daily. It is also

highly possible that for a large percentage of them English really is their best language for some purposes. Those who had used English as their medium of instruction in high school as well as college were more likely to feel that English was their best language.

Among the Thais the situation was much different. Slightly less than three percent of them reported that English was used in their homes when they were children. The same amount felt that English was their best language at present while only one student out of 313 said that English was the first language he learned. In this case the Thai questionnaire was probably less ambiguous than the English version and resulted in a more accurate picture of the English language situation in Thailand. Due to a printing error, however, the question asking for estimates of the percentage of English use in the home was left off the Thai questionnaire.

Thus as we have seen in the descriptions of the position of English in each of these countries, there is a great similarity between India and Singapore and a great difference between these two and Thailand. The dichotomy between countries where English is an official language used for intranational purposes and other nations where it is a foreign language used mainly for international communication is bound to be reflected in the educational backgrounds of students from those types of situations.

There was one factor, however, which did not reflect this dichotomy. A heavy majority in each country reported that they had received some parental encouragement for the study of English. Seventy-seven percent of the Singaporeans, 70% of the Indians, and 68% of the Thais said that

their parents had encouraged them. Not a single respondent out of 825 signaled that he had been discouraged. The rest of the parents were neutral.

The closeness of the figures is somewhat surprising; the differences are not. As we have seen, English is fast becoming the major language of Singapore and for the vast majority of these students English fluency will most probably enhance their economic and social positions. The situation in India is similar but English fluency doesn't seem to be as crucial a skill as it is in Singapore. In Thailand it is obviously not a pressing need or an overly valuable skill. One would have to surmise that the needs of the Thai students are quite different. It may also be that the Thai questionnaire's use of a strong word for "discouraged" dissuaded some respondents from choosing that option. But it is definitely safe to say that a majority of parents feel, for whatever reasons, that a knowledge of English will benefit their children and that very few parents, if any, are going to oppose the learning of English by their children. Regardless of whatever their personal feelings towards the language may be, most parents in all three of these countries probably view English as a skill that their child should acquire.

CHAPTER III

WHY WE STUDIED ENGLISH

"If English is an evil, it is a necessary evil and must continue, in the interest of unity, progress and the future of India."

P.D. Shastri
(Shastri 1977)

"English is the only language which is a medium of instruction available throughout the country and many parts of the world."

An Indian student

"It looks impressive to know English."

A Thai student

"It is an international language. Most textbooks are write in English. It is used everywhere. The owner of the language are advanced, so I would like to know more about them (through English)."

A Thai student

"My family wanted someone in the family of Chinese-educated children to speak English."

A Singapore student

"English is the most popular medium through which advanced technology and business concepts are expressed."

A Singapore student

Having gone through almost fourteen years of English language study, it is hoped that these students had some motivating factors other than the requirements of their educational system. In order to discover the forces that may have encouraged them in their study, the students were presented with a list of 25 possible reasons for language learning and asked to rate each one on a scale of one to five from "definitely my reason" to "definitely NOT my reason" thus indicating the extent to which it was one of their personal reasons for studying English. Both the Singaporeans and Indians rated fourteen of these reasons positively according to the group means. The Thais only ranked thirteen positively. All twenty-five reasons are listed below in order of their ranking by all 825 respondents as a single group. Each reason is followed by a code word which represents that reason in the table in Appendix B which gives the mean score and ranking it received from each group. Since there was a neutral choice given, the pro and con percentages do not add up to a full 100%. These percentages were calculated by adding the scores for the first two and last two choices.

1. I studied English because I will need it for my work. (Work)

This was ranked first by both the Indians and the Singaporeans and fifth by the Thais. Ninety-five percent in Singapore, 94% in India, and 86% in Thailand asserted that this was an important reason for their studying English. In addition to its importance within the country, English is also valuable for obtaining lucrative jobs with foreign business firms and international agencies and for conducting foreign trade.

2. I studied English primarily because it is required in our system. (System)

This was ranked second by the Indians and the Singaporeans and eighth by the Thais. The Singaporeans (90%) and Indians (80%) emphasized this reason much more than the Thais (63%). The difference could lie in the fact that English is only a compulsory subject in Thailand while it is an official language in the other two countries. For many of the Indians it was their medium of instruction in high school and college in addition to being a compulsory subject from fifth grade on. However, many of them probably had other options in choosing their medium of instruction. The Singaporeans had much less choice in the matter. English was a compulsory subject from the early primary grades and after 1975 it was the only medium of instruction available at the tertiary level.

3. I studied English so that I could talk to native speakers of English for business/educational reasons. (Natbus)

This was the Thais' highest ranked reason with 92% of them claiming that it played a part in their desire to learn English. The Singaporeans (78%) and Indians (74%) both ranked it as their fourth strongest reason. Its high ranking partly shows why work needs was the most popular reason overall.

4. I studied English so that I could talk to other foreigners for business/educational reasons. (Forbus)

This was ranked third overall by the Thais with 87% picking it as a personal reason while only 6% rejected it. Students in Singapore

placed it fifth with 75% of them giving it support. It was sixth for the Indians as 66% of them rated it positively. It appears that contacts with foreigners will be mainly for work or educational reasons.

5. I studied English so that I could talk to native speakers of English about general things. (Natgen)

Eighty-eight percent of the Thais stressed this reason as they rated it second. Sixty-two percent of the Indians and seventy percent of the Singaporeans believed that this was one of their reasons although they placed it in ninth and eighth place respectively. For most groups this was the first reason mentioned that was an integrative one and showed that they wanted English for something other than its utilitarian value.

6. I studied English so that I could get a good job in my own country. (Gdjob)

This was an important reason for 90% of the Singaporeans. It was third on their list. The Thais ranked it seventh as 80% of them claimed it as a reason. The Indians (65%) placed it eighth. It is common knowledge in these countries that fluency in English can lead to better paying jobs. In Singapore the disparity in the quality of jobs offered to the Chinese medium graduates of Nanyang University as opposed to those offered to the English medium graduates of the University of Singapore led to student clamor for a switch to English. The changeover was eventually made in 1975.

7. I studied English so I could talk to other foreigners about general things. (Forgen)

The Thais highly favored this reason and ranked it fourth overall. Eighty-six percent of them claimed it as a reason. The Indians (60%)

and Singaporeans (70%) were also positive about it but they placed it tenth and seventh on their lists of reasons. It is only the second integrative reason mentioned so far.

8. I studied English so I could talk to people in my own country whose language is unknown to me. (Link)

This received the strongest support from the Indian students with 81% of them viewing it as one of their reasons. It was in third place on their list. A majority of Singaporeans (67%) and Thais (59%) also thought that it was one of their considerations for studying English and both groups put it ninth in order of popularity. The importance of English as a lingua franca in Singapore and India is a well-documented fact but in predominantly monolingual Thailand it is generally thought that English does not play much of a role as a link language for intra-national communication. Perhaps the question was being interpreted as also including foreigners rather than just speakers of other indigenous languages.

9. I studied English so that I could study in a foreign country. (Study)

Seventy-nine percent of the Thais thought that this could be one of their reasons and they rated it sixth overall. It was much less crucial for Indian (45%) and Singaporean (54%) students. It was fifteenth on the Indian list and fourteenth on the Singapore list.

10. I studied English because I want to enjoy English films and radio and t.v. programs. (Film)

Predictably this reason received a large positive response from the Singaporeans (72%) who are exposed to all three of these mediums. More

airtime is given to English language programming in Singapore than to any one of the other three official languages. It was placed ninth on their list while the Indians (59%) and Thais (61%) ranked it thirteenth and eleventh respectively. Television in India is not very widespread and is not available in Hyderabad. English language radio broadcasts and movies are available. In Bangkok, American films are shown in movie halls and on television. Although most American t.v. series are dubbed for viewing, a radio station does broadcast the original soundtrack simultaneously for those who wish to hear the English version.

11. I studied English because I believe that a knowledge of another language will make me a better person. (Better)

This aspect of language study was sharply disputed by the multilingual and the monolingual countries. Seventy-one percent of the Indians and Singaporeans felt that this reason was relevant to their motivation for studying English. The Indians rated it fifth while the Singaporeans placed it sixth. However, only 33% of the Thais thought positively of this reason while 54% felt that it was of no consequence to them. This may be a reflection of the ethnocentrism to be expected in a country that is very homogeneous linguistically and that has never suffered through a long period of colonial rule. Official government policy in India and Singapore favors the development of bilingual ability and emphasizes its integrative value.

12. I studied English because it will help me to better understand English speakers and their way of life. (Life)

This is often a rationale given for language requirements in the U.S.A. It received almost equal amounts of support from Indians (59%),

Thais (56%), and Singaporeans (56%). Slightly more than 30% in each country felt that this was not a pertinent reason for themselves. The Indians placed it twelfth while the Thais and Singaporeans ranked it thirteenth. It shows that learners of English in these countries have at least some interest in learning about the native speakers of the language as well as the language.

13. I studied English because a good knowledge of it will help me get more social recognition. (Social)

The Indian students rated this as seventh. Sixty-seven percent felt that it was representative of their attitudes as opposed to 26% who thought that it was not of importance in describing their motivations. A smaller majority in Singapore (58%) also supported it while the Thais gave it a negative rating as 47% rejected it over the 41% who favored it. The high status of English fluency is a legacy of the colonial period. It was expected that this reason would be a significant one for the former members of the British Empire where English is still the language of the elite even after independence. Although English is probably more of a necessity for a Singaporean than it is for an Indian, it may be surmised that the official bilingual policy and the compulsory education system of Singapore are leading to a decrease in the elitist aspect of English fluency. With English medium education now available to all from the very earliest grades, fluency in English has become an attainable goal for the children of all economic and social classes. It is natural that as English language education spreads, it will lose some of its social significance. In India it is still the case that English medium education is largely open only to the socioeconomically well-off. In

monolingual and monoethnic Thailand, English never had the status it achieved in the British colonies. However, the fact that English came into Thailand through the actions of one of their greatest kings and that it became part of the training of the ruling elite probably did much to raise the prestige of English fluency. It will be interesting to see if the trend in Thailand is towards an increase or decrease in the social value of English. A problem with this question lies in the possibility that students will not want to admit that social recognition is one of their goals.

14. I studied English because I enjoy studying languages. (Enjoy)

It is interesting to see that the responses to this statement were in an inverse relationship to the amount of language learning required by each system. Thai students, who only have to take English as a compulsory subject, favored this view 60% to 30%. In India where they must take English as a subject and probably become fairly fluent in two or more languages in order to function well in society, only 54% favored the statement while 36% did not. In Singapore where bilingualism is strongly promoted officially and privately, a larger number of students (48%) rejected it as one of their reasons than accepted it (41%). Overall it was ranked ninth by the Thais, fourteenth by the Indians, and seventeenth by the Singaporeans.

15. I studied English because I want to read English literature for pleasure. (Lit)

The former British colonies had very similar reactions to this reason. Sixty percent of the Indians and 54% of the Singaporeans gave it a positive rating. The Indians listed it twelfth; the Singaporeans

placed it thirteenth. If they are being honest in their appraisals, these responses could be seen as an indication of the success of teachers in developing student appreciation of English literature. In both of these countries English is taught primarily through the medium of literature. India in particular has produced a large number of writers who express themselves in the English language in novels, short stories, and poetry. In Thailand there is much less of an emphasis on English literature and the development of an appreciation for it is not a goal of the educational system.

16. I studied English so that I could get a job in a foreign country. (Forjob)

The only majority supporting this statement was among the Thais (55%). They rated it twelfth. Ths Singaporeans barely gave it a positive rating as 42% supported it and 40% rejected it. Although large numbers of Indians go abroad every year in search of work, the Indian students gave it a negative rating. Forty-six percent opposed it as a reason while only 39% thought that it was one of their reasons. It was eighteenth for the Indians and fifteenth for the Singaporeans. As mentioned earlier, this was found to be the number one reason for the study of English in Jordan.

17. I studied English because I feel that no one is really educated until he is fluent in English. (Fluent)

While the Indians (47%) and Thais (49%) were slightly in favor of this statement, the Singaporeans (25%) were extremely negative and had 65% of their number deny its relevance to the study of English. This placed it nineteenth on their list. The explanation for these responses

may be similar to the one given for the responses to the statement concerning the enjoyment of studying languages. It may be that the more prevalent English fluency becomes, the smaller the amount of status assigned to the person who develops that fluency. Since most of the Thais and Indians must make a special effort to learn English well, they may attach more significance to its acquisition. The Thais and Indians rated it fourteenth and fifteenth respectively. In Singapore today, everyone is expected to learn English as a matter of course no matter what his social position is. Thus there may be less association of English fluency with sophistication and cosmopolitanism.

18. I studied English because I plan to travel to English-speaking countries someday for pleasure. (Natfun)

The Thais were the only group to concur with this statement although less than a majority (45%) picked it as one of their reasons. This made it their fifteenth reason. The Singapore response was barely negative with the statement being rated sixteenth as 39% favored it and 43% rejected it. Less than a third (30%) of the Indians picked this reason while a near majority (49%) felt that it was not one of their motives. This made it twenty-first on their list.

19. I studied English because I plan to travel to a foreign country for my work. (Forwrk)

Given the heavy emphasis on work related reasons for studying English, one might expect fairly high ratings by one or more of the groups. However, only the Indians gave it a plurality and even this was by a 39% to 38% margin. This put it in seventeenth place. The Thais ranked it the same although only 36% favored it and 49% opposed it. The Singaporeans

rated it eighteenth as the 28% who supported it were overwhelmed by the 46% who rejected it as a reason. Given the earlier expressed need for English in their work, it must be assumed that they are reacting against the travel aspect of the statement. Apparently the desire to go abroad for work purposes was not an important consideration for learning English.

20. I studied English because I plan to travel to non-English speaking countries someday for pleasure. (Nonfun)

Despite being placed in opposition to a statement regarding travel to English speaking countries, there may have been some confusion about what countries were being identified. In any case, all three groups responded negatively including the Thais who had the benefit of examples (i.e. Japan) on their questionnaire. Thirty-nine percent of the Thais believed this may have been one of their reasons while only about 15% of the other two groups agreed with it. Sixty-six percent of the Singaporeans, sixty-five percent of the Indians, and forty-nine percent of the Thais did not think that it was one of their reasons. The Thais placed it eighteenth, the Singaporeans made it twentieth, and the Indians put it at the bottom of the list of twenty-five reasons.

21. I studied English because I like the countries in which English is spoken. (Like)

All three nationalities gave negative responses. The Thais and Singaporeans placed it twenty-second and twenty-first while the Indians rated it twentieth. The Thais had 68% of their number reject this reason while 76% of the Singaporeans and a smaller majority of Indian students (52%) denied its relevance to their own situations. Reasons like this are often given as examples of the type of integrative

motivation necessary for successful second language acquisition. These responses do not necessarily mean that the majority of these students actually dislike the native speaking countries. They simply mean that an affinity for those countries did not play an important role in their decision to learn English. It may also indicate that they do not automatically associate the English language with these countries. Perhaps they see English as a bona fide international language which is not inextricably connected to any particular country or group of countries. It may be possible that they are saying that English can be learned independent of any reference to these countries.

22. I studied English because it is easy. (Easy)

The reactions to this question could have been predicted by just about any experienced classroom teacher of EFL or ESL in Asia. All groups were highly negative. In listing it nineteenth, 34% of the Indian students agreed with the statement while 51% disagreed. Twenty-one percent of the Thais supported it as a reason while 65% rejected it putting it in twenty-first place. The Singaporeans were the most negative. Only 17% of them felt that it was one of their reasons while an overwhelming 71% did not think so. This made it twenty-second for them.

23. I studied English because I like the people who are native speakers of English. (Love)

This reason received even less support than the one concerning the native speaking countries. Only 8% in Singapore, 15% in Thailand, and 30% in India felt that this was a valid statement in terms of their personal experience. Three quarters of the Singaporeans and Indians and

56% of the Thais disagreed with this statement. It was twenty-second for the Indians, twenty-fourth for the Thais, and twenty-fifth for the Singaporeans. This is another of the reasons that are putatively essential to the integrative orientation leading to second language achievement. These students may or may not like native speakers of English. What the majorities are saying here is that a favorable attitude towards native speakers was not one of the reasons that they had for learning English.

24. I studied English because I plan to travel to non-English speaking countries someday for my work. (Nonwrk)

Large majorities among the Singaporeans (69%), Thais (69%), and Indians (63%) felt that this was not one of their reasons. No more than 18% in any group supported it. The wording of this statement may have confused some students but the same results were received from the Thai version which was less vague. Apparently the need for English for travel to other countries was not an important consideration for these students. This reason was twenty-third for the Singaporeans and Thais and twenty-fourth for the Indians.

25. I studied English because it will help me to think and behave as native speakers do. (Think)

This was one of the four reasons used by Gardner and Lambert to indicate an integrative approach to language learning. Every group gave it a very negative rating. It was ranked twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth by the Indians, Singaporeans, and Thais. Ten percent of the Thais favored it while eighty-one percent opposed it; 14% of the

Singaporeans picked it as a reason while 63% rejected it. The Indians were more divided on the statement with 29% of them choosing it as one of their reasons while 59% maintained that it was not one of their reasons.

The most striking observation that comes from looking at the various reactions to the above reasons concerns the integrative and instrumental dichotomy and its relationship to second language learning. What is striking is that the reasons which are most often associated with instrumental motivation (e.g. Work, System, Natbus, Gdjob, etc.) were ranked very highly while many of the reasons indicating an integrative orientation (e.g. Like, Love, Think, etc.) were ranked near the bottom of the twenty-five reasons. The Thai and Indian students had six instrumental reasons in their top eight while the Singaporeans had five. The Thais and Indians also ranked five integrative reasons in their bottom eight while the Singaporeans placed four. The Thais were the only group to place integrative reasons among their top six (i.e. Natgen, Forgen), but it is not clear if this automatically makes the Thais more integratively oriented than any other group.

Having ranked each of the twenty-five reasons in terms of how they truly represented their own feelings, the respondents were then asked to reread the list and to pick the three reasons which were the "most important" ones for them. The following tables presents the three reasons which were most often mentioned along with the percentages of respondents who named that reason as one of their three. Because each person was allowed to make three choices the percentage totals are over 100%. Many reasons were mentioned but this table lists only the top three.

Table I

The Three Most Important Reasons For Studying English

SINGAPORE	%	INDIA	%	THAILAND	%
Work	75.5	Work	49.8	Natbus	39.9
System	50.2	System	40.8	Work	34.3
Gdjob	36.5	Social	21.4	Study	29.9

The Singaporeans picked the same three reasons in the exact same order as they did when they ranked their personal reasons. An overwhelming 75.5% of them named work needs as their most important reason for studying English. A bare majority also agreed that the requirements of the system should rank as one of the three most important reasons.

The Indians were not as consistent as the Singaporeans. While a large percentage of them picked Work and System just as they did in their earlier ranking of personal reasons, there was a big difference in their third choice. The acquisition of English for the purpose of social recognition was seventh on their list of personal reasons, but on this question it was the third most frequently mentioned item. Apparently there is a strong appreciation of its social value by 21% of the Indian students.

The most interesting differences in the sets of rankings occurred in the responses of the Thais. In rating their personal reasons for studying English, interactions with native and non-native speakers for business/educational as well as for general conversation purposes received the greatest degree of support. When naming the most important reasons, however, the Thais were more likely to choose more utilitarian reasons like Work and Study over integrative types of relationships.

The answers to this final question on reasons serve to emphasize what the earlier analysis had postulated. Instrumental motivation for learning English is much stronger and more prevalent among the students of all three of these samplings than an integrative orientation.

CHAPTER IV

WHO WE USE ENGLISH WITH

"If and when I meet them (foreigners), I will speak English."

An Indian student

"I speak English to educated teen-age and smart girls."

An Indian student

"I feel strongly objected to use foreign languages in conversation with national comrades."

A Thai student

"...only a few words to friend just for fun."

A Thai student

"I am a native speaker. English was the language I understood, wrote and spoke best before I entered formal schooling institutions."

A Singapore student

"English has provided a neutral instrument all racial and dialect groups can learn to use with no unfair bias.

"English has given us direct access to the knowledge and technology of the industiralized West.

"Without the continued use of English, Singapore would not have secured a new base for her economy and brought up to date her role in the international and regional economy."

Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew
(Lee 1977a)

Now that we know the general reasons why these students study English the next step is to find out the types of people that they use it with. In order to get a picture of the English language environment for each nationality, the questionnaire presented the respondents with a list of people and asked them to report on the frequency with which they speak English with these people in an average period of two months. Once again a division occurred between the foreign language country, Thailand, and the second language countries. In every case the Thais reported using English less often than their counterparts in the other countries. The responses of the Indians and Singaporeans were very similar as can be seen in Table II:

Table II

The Frequency of Use of Spoken English
in an Average Span of Two Months

Fellow Countrymen:	Many Times Daily 1	At least Once/Day 2	At least Once/Week 3	Very Rarely 4	Never 5
Family Members		S	I		T
Friends		SI		T	
Students		SI		T	
English Teachers	I	S		T	
Other Teachers		I S			T
Govt. Officials			I S		T
Businessmen			SI		T
Link Language*			I S		T
Foreigners:					
Native Speakers			S I	T	
Non-native Speakers			S I	T	

* Fellow Countrymen whose language you don't know.

Thailand: The Thais apparently use English much less than the other groups. Their highest frequency of use was with English teachers; their lowest was with government officials. Because the question had a time frame of two months, it is impossible to say if this low usage was due to lack of contact or to the fact that they never use English with these people. But it is evident that Thais very rarely use English with their fellow countrymen. They almost never use English with family members, other teachers, government officials, and businessmen. They also report little use of English as a link language with fellow countrymen whose language they don't know. In the previous chapter 59% had listed this as one of their reasons for studying English. This may indicate a simple difference between future hopes and present realities but it may also mean that they did not understand the earlier question very well.

Next to English teachers they are most likely to use English with friends and fellow students, but even in these cases they use it very rarely. It therefore seems that English plays a very small part in their daily lives and is not essential for their functioning in society at the present moment. It can also be said that they are more likely to use English with their peers than with their elders. It is possible that this might be a sign of more English usage in Thailand's future.

Although English teachers were ranked the highest in terms of frequency, it can be seen that this is still a very low rate. It may be that English is not used very much even in English classes. Many Thai teachers use the Thai language much more than English even when they are teaching the latter. Even in many language classrooms the Thai student's exposure to spoken English is minimal.

In the case of foreigners, the Thais reported approximately the same amount of use with native and non-native speakers. The very infrequent use of English with foreigners is most likely directly attributable to a lack of contact and opportunity.

India: English plays a much more important part in the life of an Indian student. As we saw earlier, 94% of the respondents were taking most of their coursework in English. They therefore reported frequent daily use of English with all their teachers and with their friends and fellow students. Indian students also indicated a more frequent use of English with government officials than did the other two groups. They rarely use English with family members and use it even less with businessmen. The smallest amount of use reported is with foreigners. At present they very rarely use English with native and non-native speakers from other countries which is probably because of a lack of opportunity.

Singapore: The overall average for the use of English reported by Singaporeans was slightly more than the Indians, but the difference was not statistically significant. Like the Indians they speak English many times daily with their friends, fellow students, and teachers. Their highest average was with fellow students. They used it with family members much more than any other nationality. While the Indians and Thais spoke it very infrequently at home, the Singaporeans generally used it several times a week. Like the Indians they also used it as a link language but with a little less frequency. They used it for this purpose less than once a week. Given Singapore's multilingual composition it would seem that this figure should be higher. Government officials and businessmen received the lowest frequency rating of any local group.

With foreigners they reported slightly more use of English than the other nationalities probably because of the better opportunities for meeting foreigners in a small and tourist-rich city state. There was slightly more use with native speakers (at least once a week) than with non-native speakers from other countries (less than once a week).

The Future Use of English

Respondents were also asked to anticipate the future and estimate how often they expected to speak English with similar groups of people once they had finished college and taken a job. In terms of overall use, all groups reported that they expect significant increases in the frequency of use. No decreases were noted although for some groups of people no significant increases were foreseen. The pattern of increase was very much the same for Indians and Singaporeans. Both foresaw dramatic increases in the use of English with government officials, businessmen, and with fellow countrymen as a link language. They also envisioned a greater amount of use with family members, friends, and future teachers.

The Thai students also predicted a general increase in the use of English with most groups. The greatest increase among local groups was with businessmen. No significant increases were proposed for family and friends. Moreover, the rates foreseen were still not very high. No Thai group projected a higher frequency than less than once a week.

The most dramatic increases for all three nationalities were seen as coming in their relationships with native speakers. Indians and Singaporeans predicted that they would be using English around once a day with native speakers. Even the Thais felt that they would be speaking with native speakers at least once a week as opposed to using it very

rarely now. Very significant increases were also shown for use with other non-native speakers. The Singaporeans thought that they would be using it a little less than once a day in the future instead of the present once a week. The other two groups believed they would be using it more often but never more than once a week. These increases in use will probably come from a greater amount of contact with foreigners.

Table III

The Use of English in the Future

Fellow Countrymen:	Many Times Daily 1	At least Once/Day 2	At least Once/Week 3	Very Rarely 4	Never 5
Family Members		S	I		T
Friends	SI			T	
Fellow Workers	S	I	T		
Supervisors	SI			T	
Teachers		I S		T	
Govt. Officials		I S		T	
Businessmen		S I	T		
Link Language*		IS		T	
Foreigners:					
Native Speakers		S	I T		
Non-Native Speakers		S	IT		

* Fellow countrymen whose language you don't know.

It is apparent from the figures given above that there are major differences between the amount of English used in India and Singapore on the one hand and Thailand on the other. These findings are consonant with the traditional distinctions between ESL and EFL countries. In Singapore and India, where English has the status of an official language and where it is used as a medium of instruction, we see many similarities

in the pattern of English usage. Students use English in and out of class and with their friends as well as their classmates and teachers. Their use of English with these people is much more than with foreigners. The English language occupies a legitimate place in their society and it is an aid in enabling a person to function within that society. In some cases it may even be a necessity. In looking at their future need for English the majority of students feel that they will be using it more often, but they still see that they will be using it more with their fellow countrymen than with any group of foreigners. In terms of overall use of English it seems that the Singaporeans presently use it slightly more extensively than the Indians. They also feel that they will be using it more often in the future. The Singaporeans predict a greater increase in their future use of English than any other group. The Indians predict a slightly lower increase.

The situation in Thailand is quite different. Except for their English teachers, Thai students presently use English more frequently with foreigners than with their compatriots. In looking towards the future, they see no significant increases in its use with family and friends. Instead they envision using it most often with native speakers and non-native speakers from other countries.

This dichotomy between the intranational and international use of English was most clearly outlined in a final question on the use of English. The students were asked to rank four groups of people in order of importance vis-a-vis the use of English. The statement is given below along with the rankings assigned by each nationality.

It is important for me to speak English so that I can talk to:

	Sing.	India	Thailand
a. my fellow countrymen in specific social or business situations.	1	1	3
b. fellow countrymen who do not know my first language.	2	2	4
c. native English speakers.	3	3	1
d. non-native speakers from other countries.	4	4	2

The results of these rankings clearly emphasize all of the more detailed statistics that came before. The second language situations are marked by the dominance of English for intranational purposes over international ones. Even though English is crucial for the international sphere, it is seen by these students as being even more important to them for its domestic uses. For Thailand the situation is the opposite. The importance of English lies in its usefulness for international communication, especially with native speakers.

CHAPTER V

WHAT WE WANT TO LEARN

"With the presence of large numbers of school leavers looking for jobs, education must be regarded as a means towards increasing one's usefulness in society and as a means for obtaining rewarding and satisfying employment."

Former Singaporean Minister of Science and Technology (Hassan 1976)

"I like to study English because I want to be able in speaking and understanding many languages."

A Thai student

"...to read texts, for correspondence or to communicate with non-Thai speakers."

A Thai student

"Technological know-how is available in English language."

An Indian student

Now that we have discovered the major reasons why students study English and how they are presently using it, it is necessary to find out exactly what types of skills they wish to acquire. But first it would be best to see what these students think of their present abilities so that we might better understand their aspirations. When the three groups were asked to rank the four skills in order of their abilities in each of them, the overwhelming first choice of all the groups was reading. Every group also picked speaking as its worst skill. The Singaporeans and Indians both picked listening as their second best and writing as their third best. The Thais had the order of these skills reversed. The following chart lists the four skills that were rated and gives the percentage of respondents who judged those skills to be either their best or their worst.

Table IV

The Ranking of the Four Skills

	Singapore		India		Thailand	
Skills	%Best	%Worst	%Best	%Worst	%Best	%Worst
Reading	75	10	73	9	81	8
Listening	55	17	50	30	39	42
Writing	36	45	38	38	39	31
Speaking	33	47	25	59	30	62

It is interesting to note the division between active and passive skills made by the Singaporeans and Indians and the great similarities in the percentage spreads. The receptive skills of reading and listening are by far the highest ranked while the productive skills of speaking

and writing are the lowest. For the Thais the difference comes between the mechanical skills of reading and writing and the interactive skills of listening and speaking. This is probably to be expected in a foreign language situation as in Thailand where English is rarely used in any context other than with foreigners. In the second language countries of India and Singapore it is of course used much more. Since most of those respondents were from English medium high schools and colleges, they are obviously more adept at listening comprehension than the Thais. However, despite their much greater use of English in and out of the classroom, they are unsure of their speaking ability.

Are they content vis a vis their abilities in these four skills? When asked to pick the one skill that they wanted to be their best, they produced the responses that are presented in the following table which shows the percentage of people mentioning that particular skill. Since some students named more than one skill the totals may reach over 100%.

Table V

The Skill I Want To Be My Best

	%Singaporeans	%Indians	%Thais
Speaking	72.6	71.4	88.0
Writing	35.3	23.0	8.7
Listening	6.7	5.0	31.1
Reading	6.2	10.7	9.5

The results of this question show that all groups are overwhelmingly disposed towards making speaking their best skill, but as we have already seen, all groups feel that this is by far their worst skill. Among the

Indians and Singaporeans the second greatest amount of support was in favor of writing which they had both rated as their third best skill. The Thais also followed this pattern with their third ranked skill, listening, receiving the largest amount of support next to speaking. In fact over 21% of the Thais specifically mentioned both speaking and listening together as the skills that they wanted to be their best.

Because of these results the question must be raised if the respondents are truly picking the skill they want to be their best or if they are only expressing their desire to see their weakest skill improve. No doubt the latter factor is at work to some extent. Even though the question specifically asked the respondents to pick the one skill they wanted to be their best, some were probably consciously or unconsciously influenced by the fact that reading was already their best skill. However, a number of educators from these three countries feel that it is definitely true that the majority of students do wish to develop their speaking ability more than their other skills. If this is so, then there is a classic confrontation occurring in Asian classrooms between the school system and the students' desires. If these statistics are in fact a true reflection of reality, the schools are not giving students what they want. This may simply be because of an inability to meet this need for conversational skills, or it may also stem from a different view of student needs held by educators. It may be a case of the administrators feeling that they really know what is best for the students and the nation. But even if this is a true scenario, there must be detrimental effects in the classroom and this difference in opinion presents a problem that needs to be addressed.

Perhaps the situation would become clearer if we knew the type of skills that students feel are important to them. In this section of the questionnaire, students were given a list of fifteen language skills and situations and asked to rate each one according to its importance to them. A majority of Indians and Singaporeans rated all fifteen of the skills as being important or extremely important to them. A majority of Thais only agreed on eight skills. A plurality gave overall positive ratings to just ten skills. The highest rankings for each group went to the same three skills although the order for each group was different. These three skills were:

a. Being able to write papers, reports, and business letters in English. (Report)

b. Being able to read textbooks, reports, articles, etc. in English. (Text)

c. Being able to talk with native speakers of English in work situations. (Takwrk)

The Singaporeans ranked them one, two, three with an average of 96% of the students claiming them as important skills and only 2% feeling that they were unimportant ones. The Indians ranked them two, one, and three. An average of 89% of them felt that they were important and only 3% of their colleagues disagreed. The Thais ranked them three, two, one with an average support of 89% as opposed to 2% who rated them as unimportant. The other skills which were evaluated were as follows:

d. Being able to talk with a native speaker of English in social situations. (Taksoc)

A strong majority in each group rated this as an important skill. Seventy-nine percent of the Singaporeans, 68% of the Indians, and 65% of the Thais felt that it was important.

e. Being able to talk to your fellow countrymen in social situations. (Felsoc)

The Singaporeans were very positive about the need for this skill. They voted 73% to 2% in support of it. The Indians (54/14) were less enthusiastic about it. A slight majority of Thais (15/54) felt that this was an unimportant skill. Once again the differences reflect the status of English in these countries and the dichotomy of ESL/EFL language situations.

f. Being able to talk to your fellow countrymen in work situations. (Felwrk)

This need received more support than the use of English in social situations and the range of responses between groups was about the same. Both the Singaporeans (87/1) and the Indians (65/11) felt that this was an important skill. More Thais (23/41) supported this skill than the preceding one, but there was still a general dismissal of it as an unimportant need.

g. Being able to talk to non-native speakers from other countries in social situations. (Taknon)

Sixty-two percent of the Indians and Singaporeans rated this as important while only 8% and 13% of those groups judged it as unimportant. Fifty-two percent of the Thais thought it was important but 41% judged it "neither important nor unimportant".

h. Being able to talk with non-native speakers from other countries in work situations. (Wrknon)

This skill received about the same amount of support from Singaporeans (75/6), Indians (72/8) and Thais ((75/3). Once again the use of English in work situations proved to be more important than in social situations.

i. Being able to understand radio and t.v. broadcasts. (Radio)

Reactions to this skill seemed to closely follow the actual broadcasting situation in each country. More students in Singapore (79/2) supported it than did Indians (61/12) or Thais (49/13). There is a much greater percentage of broadcasting done in English in Singapore than in the other two countries. Thailand probably has the least although it does have more television time than India.

j. Being able to enjoy films in English. (Movies)

The Singaporeans (69/3) were stronger in supporting this skill than either the Indians (60/12) or the Thais (40/15). The Bangkok students probably have a much greater opportunity to see English films than do their Indian counterparts in Hyderabad. Bangkok normally has a number of American movies showing each week. In Hyderabad there may only be one available each week and it is usually an older film. Both Thailand and India have strong indigenous film industries while the Singaporeans rely mostly on imported films.

k. Being able to read English literature for pleasure. (Litfun)

The Indians (67/14) and Singaporeans (66/11) were about the same in their feeling of the importance of this skill. The Thais (28/13) were much less enthusiastic about reading English literature. Forty-nine percent of them felt that it was "neither important nor unimportant". There is obviously a great difference in the appreciation of English literature between the former British colonies and Thailand.

l. Being able to read foreign newspapers, magazines, etc. in English for pleasure. (Mags)

This proved to be a popular goal for all of the groups. The Indians (79/5) and Singaporeans (76/4) were stronger in their support than the Thais (64/4). Unlike the reaction to the statement on English language broadcasting, the responses here were not in accordance with the amount available. The students in Hyderabad have much less access to foreign periodicals than residents of Bangkok and Singapore.

m. Being able to write personal letters in English to foreigners. (Letter)

The Singaporeans (78/8), Indians (72/10), and Thais (65/7) were strongly in agreement that this was an important skill. Although at present the students in Hyderabad have fewer opportunities to meet foreigners than do the students in Bangkok, more of them felt a need for this skill. They may envision more contact in the future or place more value on maintaining such relationships. Finding pen pals is a popular pastime with many Indian students.

n. Being able to write personal letters in English to fellow countrymen. (Person)

The Singaporeans (74/7) and Indians (66/11) again showed the importance of English for intranational communication. Only 15% of the Thais thought that this was important while 60% felt the opposite. This was the lowest rating given to any skill by the Thais and reveals the lack of importance of English for intranational interactions. It is interesting to see that the other two groups place almost as much value on this as they do on writing to foreigners.

o. Being able to write stories, articles, etc. in English. (Story)

The Singaporeans (58/16) gave this skill their lowest rating. The Indians (63/12) were more positive about this use of English. This perhaps is a reflection of the fact that English is also a literary language in India. There are many excellent Indian poets, novelists, and short story writers who write primarily in English. A surprising number of Indian students also occasionally write poetry in English. This love of the language and its use for expressive as well as utilitarian purposes is probably greater in India than in either of the other two countries. A majority of Thais (19/51) felt that this was an unimportant skill for them.

After looking at the variations in the responses to these fifteen skills, one can see a number of patterns emerging. While Singaporeans feel that it is more important to be able to talk to native speakers in work situations than to fellow countrymen, fellow countrymen rate above other non-native speakers. With each group, however, the work situation is rated more important than its contrasting social situation. Listening to the radio and t.v. is more important than watching films. (The former is a source of news as well as entertainment.) Reading texts is more important than reading English literature and writing reports and business letters is stressed much more than writing personal letters. There is a continual emphasis on the instrumental use of English over the integrative use. The responses of the Indians and Thais are the same in this respect. More importance is placed on the use of English language skills in work situations. A difference does appear in that both of these countries generally emphasize use with native and non-native speakers above that with fellow countrymen in the same situation.

In looking at the rankings of the fifteen skills, we see that there is a mixture of the four general skills. While all three groups are unanimous in wishing that their speaking ability was their best general skill, this does not mean that they are uninterested in or deprecating the value of the other skills. As we have already seen, the three specific skills ranked highest by all three groups basically cover the four basic skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. All three nationalities agree on the prime importance of being able to write reports and business letters, read textbooks, and converse with native speakers. The fact that they feel a need for the development of all four skills is supported by their views on how the time of an English class should be distributed among the four skills. The following table shows how each group would allocate the minutes of an English language class between the four skills.

Table VI

The Division of English Class Time Among the Four Skills #1

	Singapore	India	Thailand
Reading	21.0%	29.0%	20.8%
Writing	25.6%	23.2%	20.0%
Speaking	32.5%	27.0%	33.2%
Listening	20.9%	20.8%	26.0%

Except for the number one ranking given to speaking by the Indians, the three groups generally followed a pattern of allocating more time to their weakest skills.

As interesting as the differences in allotment of time is the fact that all of the skills were apportioned a solid amount of time. No skill was given less than 20% of class time. We can therefore conclude that while students may favor one skill more than another or place more value on the use of English in certain situations, they generally feel a need for the development of all four skills. No one is advocating a state of verbal fluency with illiteracy or any other such radical training. They have definite views on which of the skills should be emphasized but few of them want to limit themselves to the cultivation of only a few skills.

There is another way in which class time can be divided which will indicate something about how the students view their need for English. This is related to the contexts in which the language is taught and the content of a class. It is a rare class that spends all of its time purely on language skills. Language classes are often seen as forums for the learning of the cultures that use that particular language. A language can also be taught through the literature written in that language. When asked to indicate the percentage of English class time that they would spend on these three areas, the respondents made these allocations:

Table VII

The Division of English Class Time #2

	Singapore	India	Thailand
The Four Language Skills (reading, writing, etc.)	54.3%	55.8%	67.0%
English Literature	27.3%	26.3%	16.0%
The Cultures of English-Speaking Countries	18.3%	17.9%	17.0%

All three groups agreed that the majority of class time should be spent on the development of the four basic skills. Only one student out of 825 advocated spending no time on the skills themselves. The Singaporeans and Indians were almost identical in the amounts of time they allocated to each topic. They both wanted to spend over a quarter of their time on English literature and less than a fifth on studying the cultures of the English speaking countries. Six percent of the Singaporeans were against spending any time on the literature while nine percent felt that no time should be used for studying the cultural aspects. For the Indians, the percentage figures were 8.7% against literature and 15% against teaching culture. With almost 16% of the respondents in opposition, the teaching of native-speaker cultures would seem to be the most controversial of the three areas for the Indians.

Among the Thai students, however, the greatest opposition was to the teaching of English literature. Twelve percent of the Thais were against doing this while only 8% refused to spend any time on culture learning. This is an expected reaction considering that Thais are interested in English for the purposes of work and foreign contacts, but since they are thinking mostly about the use of English with native speakers, it is a little surprising that they failed to give more time to the learning of foreign cultures.

CHAPTER VI

WHAT WE FEEL ABOUT ENGLISH

"The English have gone back leaving our land to be ruled by ourselves, but English has remained and persists to rule our minds and education still."

M.P. Desai
(Desai 1956)

"...unless English is retained as the only official language of the Indian Union, this curse of confusion of tongues will lead us to destruction. Should, however, English be throttled to death, India dies."

Niranjan Niyogi
(Niyogi 1965)

"The British speak English; the Americans speak slang."

An Indian student

"Indians speak the best English in the world."

An Indian student

"English is an international and necessary language."

A Thai student

"The litmus test of this is when one is abroad in a bus on a train or aeroplane and when one overhears someone speaking, one can immediately say that this is someone from Malaysia or Singapore. And I should hope that when I'm speaking abroad my countrymen will have no problem recognizing that I am a Singaporean."

T.T.B. Koh, U.N. Representative
(Tongue 1974)

We now have some idea of why these students want to learn English and the types of skills that they wish to cultivate. We also have a good idea of their present use of English and the people with whom they plan to use it in the future. Now we will examine how they feel about the language itself. We shall look at their attitudes towards English and their estimates of what the future holds for the language. We shall also see what variety they think their country should propagate.

English came to most of Asia on the ships of the British East India Company. This great mercantile agency established outposts in much of Asia and was the seed from which grew the great British Empire in the Orient. Throughout the early years of colonization, the Company encouraged the teaching of English in its domains only to the extent of providing enough English-speaking local employees to meet its needs. Local educational systems were allowed to use the vernacular languages. In the second quarter of the nineteenth century, however, the British changed their policy and began to get actively involved in English language education. Whatever their policy was, however, it was a certainty that the language of the colonial rulers was bound to become something more than just another foreign language for the ruled peoples.

For some Britishers, the acquisition of English was the same as the acquisition of culture. The center of the world was England and those who didn't know her language could not be truly cosmopolitan. Colonial peoples, in particular, could not be considered educated if they lacked fluency in English. So while the introduction of English by the Company originated from purely instrumental reasons, the language soon took on

many integrative functions. To know English was to open the door to English culture, religion, and technology and clear the path for real economic and social development.

Needless to say there were many Asians who came to adopt this attitude also. Because the power lay with the British, their language automatically achieved high status. A knowledge of English led to better jobs, contact with the rulers, and increased opportunities for personal advancement. In the eyes of others the language was the key to open the door to Britsh culture and to learn the secrets which allowed a tiny island nation to rule a large part of the world. Perhaps this knowledge would hasten the day of their own liberation.

But the language was always bound to be seen by the vast majority as the language of oppression. Thus there emerged a love-hate relationship between the colonized and the language of the colonizers that has existed up to the present day. A knowledge of English could lead to more money, an easier life, and the learning of social, economic, and military advances that made the Western nations so powerful. But each time it was heard in the streets and homes of Asian countries it was another reaffirmation that their destiny was not theirs to determine. It was a reawakening slap in the face that told them that their country was not truly theirs; that their lives and their children's lives were subject to the control of a ruling elite of a different race and creed.

Today the British Empire is only a fact of history and not a reality. The students in universities now have no first hand reminescences of the colonial era. But their parents' memories are still quite vivid and the spirit of anti-colonialism and nationalism is still strong. Has the English language weathered the years any better than the political

entities that brought her to Asia? In order to find out how today's college seniors feel about the English language they were given a number of statements and asked for their reactions on a five point scale of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". These statements were designed to obtain their personal feelings towards the language itself.

1. Of all the foreign languages I could study I like English the best.

Some students in Singapore and Hyderabad objected to this statement because they considered English to be their native language or second language and not a foreign language. The responses fell as follows:

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	57.8	4.8	37.4
India	74.1	8.6	17.3
Thailand	63.5	12.2	24.2

A majority of all groups agreed with this statement with the Indians giving by far the most favorable reaction. The Singaporeans gave the smallest amount of support but also had the smallest percentage of disagreement.

2. I don't like English but I speak it because it is useful.

This is an attitude which would reflect the love-hate relationship with English that was mentioned earlier. Very strong agreement with this statement would show that the use of English is based purely upon instrumental motives and/or that the view of English as a symbol of imperialism is still very much alive.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	17.3	64.3	18.4
India	17.3	68.1	14.6
Thailand	13.1	68.7	18.2

This attitude gets very little support from any national groups. This would seem to indicate that there is some personal attachment to this "foreign" language on the part of a majority of students.

3. If English were NOT taught in our schools, I would NOT try to learn it.

One of the highest ranked reasons for studying English was because it was required in the system. The above questions seemed to show that the students have some kind of personal commitment to the language beyond what it will do for them in terms of money, status, etc. This statement tests the stength of that commitment and the responses should reveal something about what would happen if English were an optional subject and not a required one.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	11.3	70.2	18.5
India	22.4	59.8	17.8
Thailand	8.0	78.6	13.4

Surprisingly the study of English received the strongest support from that group of students, the Thais, who use it and need it less than the others. They are much more positive about learning English outside the system than the Indians, who have already shown their need and love for English. Apparently there is a strong minority of Indian students who feel that they could get along without English. The strong showing by the Thais may somewhat refelct the fact that given the present educational system in Thailand they often do have to go outside of the regular schools to gain a useful level of English fluency. The American University Alumni Language School in Bangkok, for instance, runs classes attended by thousands of students everyday. In Singapore and India

where English is available as a medium of instruction there is much less need and demand for outside sources of English teaching. These differences, however, should not obscure the fact that a majority of students in all three countries maintain that they would make a special effort to learn English even if it were not taught in their school system.

The previous results then show that English is not an imposed burden to the majority of students. Most of them would try to learn it even if it were not a requirement, and most of them seem to have an attraction for the language that goes beyond its immediate usefulness. Unlike their forefathers, they don't seem to be saying that English is a distasteful necessity that they would rather do without if possible. This is not to say that they would continue to learn it even if it were as useless as Latin, but that English has lost much of its coloring as a colonial legacy. The students are looking towards the future and not back at the past.

The future is the central theme of the next group of statements. Everyone in the world is knowledgeable about the spread of English and its imposition on much of the world. But what does the future hold for the English language? Has it reached its zenith and is it destined to recede back to its position as one of many national languages or is it truly on its way to becoming the world language that many have dreamed of? In order to discover what students feel about these questions, they were asked to comment upon the following statements:

4. English is important only because of the poltical, economic, and social power of the United States and Great Britain.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	28.1	45.5	26.4
India	24.1	54.1	21.8
Thailand	81.2	9.2	9.6

It was assumed that there would be broad agreement on the historical fact that English was spread worldwide through the power of its native speaking nations. But in the post-colonial era can we still say that its status remains high because of that same power? The second language countries disagree. Perhaps they are willing to claim for themselves some of the credit for the importance of English in the world today. Perhaps they are saying that English is an international language now and relies far less on the might of its native speakers for it propagation and cultivation than it did previously. Only the foreign language country, Thailand, seems to be seeing English mainly in the framework of it being the native language of certain nationalities who have long dominated the world scene.

One problem with this question involved the use of the word "only". It may have been too subtle for some who read the English version. In the Thai translation it was not strongly and clearly worded that way. It should have been underlined in both of the questionnaires.

The next statement elicited opinions of what would happen if this situation drastically changed.

5. If the United States and Great Britain lose their power, English will not continue to be a world language.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	11.4	64.1	24.5
India	10.0	73.8	16.2
Thailand	28.4	49.5	22.1

The reactions of the Singaporeans and Indians show that they firmly believe that English has attained a position in the world that is much more solid than the base on which it was built. Even the Thais think that English may withstand the decline in influence of its major backers. These results seem to support the earlier comments that English has achieved a status that may be independent of the power of the native speaking nations. There already may be more non-native speakers of English than native speakers. Since the latter groups no longer exercise suzerainty over the former, it can be theorized that the English language is nearing or has passed a crossroads with one road leading to a decline in its importance as a world language, another reducing it to the status of one of many national languages, and a third road that leads to its decolonization, internationalization, and indigenization. In this state it becomes not only a language for international use but also for intranational purposes as it is now used in India and Singapore.

Part of the answer to the question of which road English has taken can be found in the responses given to two further statements.

6. I plan to make sure that my children learn English well.

People will often make many types of claims about their own aspirations and motivations. It is assumed that they will be more earnest when discussing the future of their children. In any case the responses to this statement should reveal much about what these students think of the future of English. The percentages may also give some indication of whether or not the use of the English language will continue to grow.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	94.0	0.0	6.0
India	89.1	2.7	8.2
Thailand	86.8	1.0	12.2

There was far more agreement to this statement than to any other in this section. It is even greater than the heavily positive responses in Chapter II that showed their own parents' encouragement of their English language study. The desire to see one's children better off than oneself is one of the most common of human traits. It is obvious that an overwhelming majority of each group feels that a knowledge of English will be beneficial for their children. They definitely must feel that English is going to be an important language in the future.

7. In the distant future, most of the people in the world will know English.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	78.0	6.5	15.5
India	70.2	7.9	21.9
Thailand	76.3	6.7	17.0

Large majorities supported this somewhat radical statement while only a small percentage disagreed. Evidently most of these students feel that the future of English is bright and that its number of speakers will continue to expand.

8. I think that we should learn English without paying attention to the cultures of the native speaking countries.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	17.3	60.1	22.6
India	50.7	30.5	18.8
Thailand	5.4	78.0	16.6

Here is a rare disagreement between the second language countries. The Singaporeans are strongly against ignoring the cultural aspect of language learning while a majority of the Indians favor the dropping of that topic. The Indians are possibly more liberated from the idea that language is inextricably connected to the culture that spawned it or perhaps they are simply rejecting the study of the cultures of other countries in a language context, especially when one of those cultures is their former colonial master. It could reflect the fact that the Indian experience with the British Empire was much more bitter than the Singaporean experience.

The Thais maintain their foreign language outlook. They feel that language instruction should contain some insights into the cultures that use that language.

The question of language varieties is one that can be as complicated as the language and culture issue. It may be even more difficult for these students since it may be one that they have rarely given thought to. In order to get some insights into their feelings on this problem, they were asked to express their opinions on six defferent statements. These deal with such areas as the existence of a local form of English, the variety of English spoken in the country and its intelligibility, and the question of which variety should be propagated.

Perhaps the most publicized and studied non-native variety of English other than the various pidgins is Indian English. In recent years there has been some research on the varieties in Singapore. The English of Singapore and Malaysia by R. Tongue (1974) is the latest in these efforts. Very little has been done to identify and document a

Thai variety. To see if the students themselves were knowledgeable about this question, the following statement was presented to them:

9. In this country we have our own variety of English which is different from American, British, and Australian English.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	73.1	12.0	14.9
India	81.6	11.1	7.3
Thailand	24.7	50.7	4.6

Apparently the amount of research done on each English language situation directly reflects the degree of consciousness among students about this issue. Again there is a split between the second language countries and the foreign language one. It is probably natural that the countries which use a language regularly for intranational purposes will develop a sense of having their own variety much sooner than a country which uses it mostly for international communication.

Perhaps now is the time to see what variety of English they think is being used in their country. To get this information the students were given a list of five varieties and asked to choose the one that was spoken by educated speakers in their country. The five choices were: 1) British English; 2) American English; 3) Australian English; 4) unique to my country; 5) like educated non-native speakers from other countries. The percentages of students choosing each variety were as follows:

Table VIII

The Variety of English Presently Spoken
By Educated Speakers in My Country

	%Singaporeans	%Indians	%Thais
1. British	40.5	27.4	6.5
2. American	6.0	3.2	28.1
3. Australian	0.6	0.0	0.0
4. Unique	42.3	50.6	40.3
5. Others	10.6	18.8	25.1

The Singaporeans were almost evenly divided between describing the English used by their educated speakers as akin to British English or a variety unique to Singapore. These differing views of the situation were similar to the divisions within the Indian group. While half of the Indians felt that a form of Indian English was prevalent, more than a quarter of them felt that British English was closer to the norm. These percentages are very similar to those found by Kachru (1976). Twenty-nine percent of his respondents chose British English, 3% chose American English, and 56% picked Indian English.

The Thais were quite divided in their efforts to describe the present situation. This may be due to their lack of familiarity with the issue of varieties. Although on an earlier question they failed to agree that they had a local variety, on this question a plurality believes that their educated class does indeed speak a unique form of English. However, there are other strong groups saying that Thai English is the same as American English or like the English spoken by non-native speakers from other countries. Australian English receives almost no mention.

The strong showing for British English in India and Singapore and for American English in Thailand reflects the historical relationships between these countries. British colonialism has already been discussed here. The American presence in Thailand has not been examined, but it is only necessary to say that the American military used to have extensive bases throughout Thailand and that at the height of the Viet Nam war over fifty thousand American troops were stationed in Thailand. Thousands more came into Bangkok each month on leave from the front.

The number of people voting for the nebulous category of a variety "like educated non-native speakers from other countries" is also interesting. Eleven percent in Singapore, 19% in Hyderabad, and over 25% in Bangkok made this choice to describe their English language situation among its educated. For those who had no idea of how to categorize the situation it may have been the safest choice, but could it also be that many felt that it represented a form of international English that transcended national borders?

We now have a good idea of how these students view the English language situation in their countries and what type of English they believe is used. Now we shall see what they think about the intelligibility of this variety.

11. The variety of English spoken in this country can be easily understood by foreigners.

Unfortunately this question was not specific enough in describing the variety under question. In Singapore much is said about "Singlish", the basolectal variety. It is impossible to tell if the respondents were thinking of this type of variety or of an educated variety in the acrolectal range.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	63.1	17.3	19.6
India	72.2	5.8	22.0
Thailand	40.6	25.6	33.8

The Indians were the group most positive about the intelligibility of their own variety. Indeed, one Indian student made the claim that "Indians speak the best English in the world". It is interesting to note the great differences between the second language countries and Thailand. The Indians and Singaporeans are confident of being understood by foreigners while the Thais are more divided on the question. This could be an indication of the system's failure to instill in them a confidence in their language ability or it could simply be a result of the fact that they use English much less than the students from the other two countries.

The final question to be dealt with is that of the variety that should be taught in the schools. In order to find out what the students thought about this problem, they were presented with the next three statements:

12. I believe that we should teach our own educated variety of English in our schools.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	28.7	40.7	30.6
India	59.6	22.4	18.0
Thailand	43.1	26.3	30.6

More than most of the statements, this brought about great divisions within groups. The Indians were the only group with a majority taking a single position. In this case over 59% of them were in favor of teaching an educated local form of English while on a previous question over 81% felt that at least one local variety existed. The wording of the

statements does not automatically make a connection between the variety mentioned in each statement. The variety or varieties recognized in the first statement may or may not be the "educated" variety mentioned in this statement.

While 73% of the Singaporeans felt that they had a local variety of English, only about 29% favored teaching a local form in their schools. The responses of the Thais are very confusing. Only a quarter of them felt that they had a distinct local variety in use in Thailand. However, 43% agreed that their own educated variety should be taught in their schools. Perhaps they don't think of their own educated variety as being very much different from the native varieties. Perhaps they really are confused with this talk of varieties.

A second possibility for use in the schools is covered in this next statement:

13. I believe that we should teach a native variety of English in our schools.

	%Agree	%Disagree	%Neither
Singapore	31.1	28.8	40.1
India	39.0	32.7	28.3
Thailand	85.3	7.7	7.0

The students in Hyderabad and Singapore were very divided on this question. Both supported it but only by small pluralities. Large numbers of students were unable to make a decision. The Thais, on the other hand, came out heavily for the use of a native variety as the model for its schools to follow.

The final question in this section sought to clarify the situation even further by having the student identify the specific variety that they wished to see propagated. They were asked to complete the sentence:

14. I think that we should learn to speak English...

The choices given them were: 1) like the British; 2) like the Americans; 3) like the Austalians; 4) in our own way; 5) like educated non-native speakers from other countries. The table below gives their responses:

Table IX

The Variety That We Should Learn To Speak

Variety	%Singaporeans	%Indians	%Thais
1. British	38.3	28.5	49.1
2. American	14.4	12.0	31.6
3. Australian	0.6	0.3	0.3
4. Own Way	38.9	47.4	3.5
5. Others	7.8	11.8	15.5

The Singaporeans were equally divided between accepting a British standard or a unique one of their own making. A plurality of Indians was definitely in favor of propagating their local variety. These are much different than Kachru's figures for graduate students. In 1976 he reported that 66.6% were for the British standard and 5% for the American variety while only 22% were in favor of an Indian English. The disparity in the two sets of figures might be attributed to differences in a number of factors such as age, location, etc. but is still somewhat surprising considering the closeness of the other sets of figures.

The Thais are solidly behind the establishment of a native speaker norm with British English receiving the greatest amount of support. It

is in this comparison of native speaker versus non-native speaker standards that we can see some trends in the choice of a target variety. The following table compares the totals of the figures given for these two types of standards in the descriptions given by the students of the present language situation as they see it and how they would like it to develop.

Table X

Percentages of Students Choosing
Native and Non-Native Standards

	PRESENT			FUTURE		
	Sing.	Indians	Thais	Sing.	Indians	Thais
Native	47.0	30.6	34.5	53.3	40.9	80.9
Non-Native	53.0	69.4	65.5	46.7	59.1	19.1

A purely statistical interpretation of the above figures would have to point out the possibility of a trend away from the status quo and towards a native speaker standard. Each nationality has a larger number of people promoting a native speaker variety than there are people who believe that such standard is now the norm. The most extreme case is Thailand where only 35% described educated Thai English as similar to a native variety while over 80% agreed that such a variety should be the desired model. This is very close to the 85% that thought that such a model should be taught in the schools. Concurrently there are fewer people aiming for a non-native variety than there are claiming that a non-native variety is now the norm. For instance, 69% of the Indians thought that a non-native variety was typical of the present situation

among educated speakers. In choosing their standard for the future, however, only 59% opted for a non-native variety. Looking at the figures in this light one must conclude that the present situation is not satisfactory to some people and that these people would welcome the adoption of a native speaker model.

However, to look at these figures in terms of the shifting of percentage points is to miss the outstanding message that these statistics convey. For hundreds of years the native speaker standard has ruled supreme as the only conceivable goal for a foreign language learner. Yet in 1978 we see 59% of these Indian students and almost 48% of the Singaporeans naming non-native varieties as the ultimate goal for language learning. In 1975 Kachru (1976) found that only 22% of the graduate students he surveyed favored a form of Indian English as opposed to the 47% found in this undergraduate survey. Without more information about his study it is impossible to discover the cause of this great difference, however, one must consider the possibility that these differences indicate a trend towards the acceptance of local models of English. Certainly this trend is much more of a realistic possibility than any sort of movement towards a native standard since the latter formerly had the unquestioning support of almost everyone. This support is still very strong in EFL countries like Thailand but has been sharply eroding in ESL countries like India and Singapore where English is used for intranational as well as international purposes. It is a possibility that these figures may symbolize a veritable revolution in opinion that will change the direction of the development of English as a world language.

CHAPTER VII

SOME CONCLUSIONS

"Imagine the fame and wealth awaiting the poet or author who can express the feelings of the peoples of Southeast Asia (in English) in vivid, elegant and crisp prose, or fluid emotive poetry.

"He would be feted in New York, London, and be read by most important people around the world. The advantages of the English language are manifest."

Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew
(Lee 1977b)

It is often said that statistics can be made to prove whatever you want to prove. Much of the actual data was presented in this paper so that the readers could draw their own conclusions. My interpretation of it leads me to make the following general observations:

1. Given the usual dichotomy in the type of answers given by the Indian and Singaporean students on the one hand and the Thai students on the other, it is obvious that there is great value in using the international/intranational distinction in order to describe various English language situations. Although almost all countries would be using English for international purposes, the number of nations using it within their own culture would be much smaller. The degree of its use for both purposes would probably also show great fluctuations.

2. The reasons for studying English and the skills desired are overwhelmingly the ones normally labelled instrumental. The generally high level of English ability observed in the intranational countries seems to throw doubt on the hypothesis that integrative motivation is essential for achievement in second language acquisition. This theory would probably be more valid for true second language situations where there is a community of native speakers nearby the learner. The whole aspect of integrative motivation should also be reexamined in terms of the desire of some learners to learn English in order to become a member of an indigenous group of English language speakers or a vague international one rather than a community of foreign native speakers.

3. The future growth of the use of English seems to be a certainty if these students are representative of other groups and other countries. They now plan to use it more often in the future and to have their

children learn it too. They also forsee an expansion in its use throughout the world. This expansion will not come through conquests made by the native speaking countries but through increased contacts between all peoples because of the needs arising out of the development of a world society and an international market place. The growth of English will no doubt be partly due to the still impressive influence wielded by the native speaking countries, but a large part of the growth will be because of the basic need for a world language of trade, diplomacy, etc. There are already Egyptians in Kuwait and Indians in Yemen working as English language program advisors. English has become a creation too big and important to be left to its originators alone. It is now the world's business.

4. A major factor aiding this growth will be the decolonization and indigenization of English. It is now seen less as a symbol of imperialism and more as a viable candidate for the world's most important international language. It is also becoming viewed as a local language by those using it for intranational purposes. There is an increasing acceptance of these educated local forms as varieties to be supported as much if not more than native varieties. This movement will have important repercussions on the way English is taught in the non-native speaking countries. It also raises the question of its effect upon the mutual intelligibility of these varieties.

5. As the number of non-native speakers grows and as they increasingly come to accept English as one of their own languages and not a tool borrowed from someone else, the future of English will become less and less controlled by the native speaker arbiter in areas outside his homeland. It is often said that the British gave the English language

to the world. Perhaps the time has come when the world has finally decided to fully accept the gift.

APPENDIX A

THE COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

SINGAPORE, REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

*1. Nanyang University
Dept. of Commerce, English Language Unit.

*2. Ngee Ann Technical College
English Language Unit.

3. Regional Language Centre

*4. University of Singapore
Depts. of English, Engineering, and Commerce

HYDERABAD, ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA

*5. Badruka College
Dept. of Commerce.

6. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages

*7. Jawaharlal Nehru Technical Institute
Dept. of Engineering.

*8. Nizam College
Dept. of English.

*9. Osmania Univeristy
Dept. of Engineering.

*10. Reddy College
Dept. of English.

*11. St. Francis College
Depts. of English and Commerce.

BANGKOK, THAILAND

12. Central Institute of English, Mahidol University

*13. Chulalongkorn University
Depts. of English, Engineering, Education, and Commerce.

*14. Sri Nakarin Wirot College
Dept. of English.

---

* Institutions supplying respondents.

*15. Thammasat University
Depts. of English and Commerce

16. English Language Center, Chulalongkorn University

HONOLULU, HAWAII, U.S.A.

17. University of Hawaii
Dept. of English as a Second Language
English Language Institute
Hawaii English Language Project

18. Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center

APPENDIX B

REASONS FOR STUDYING ENGLISH

	SINGAPORE	MEAN	INDIA	MEAN	THAILAND	MEAN
1.	Work	1.418	Work	1.457	Natbus	1.527
2.	System	1.653	System	1.855	Natgen	1.713
3.	Gdjob	1.782	Link	2.021	Forbus	1.721
4.	Natbus	2.100	Natbus	2.118	Forgen	1.823
5.	Forbus	2.195	Better	2.175	Work	1.836
6.	Better	2.324	Forbus	2.348	Study	2.073
7.	Forgen	2.371	Social	2.362	Gdjob	2.122
8.	Natgen	2.391	Gdjob	2.438	System	2.537
9.	Film	2.402	Natgen	2.493	Enjoy	2.580
10.	Link	2.482	Forgen	2.518	Link	2.585
11.	Social	2.624	Lit	2.621	Film	2.667
12.	Lit	2.671	Life	2.668	Forjob	2.755
13.	Life	2.746	Film	2.755	Life	2.904
14.	Study	2.871	Enjoy	2.778	Fluent	3.026
15.	Forjob	3.088	Study	2.994	Natfun	3.133
16.	Natfun	3.135	Fluent	3.039	Social	3.315
17.	Enjoy	3.198	Forwrk	3.062	Forwrk	3.369
18.	Forwrk	3.329	Forjob	3.211	Nonfun	3.372
19.	Fluent	3.763	Easy	3.389	Lit	3.498
20.	Nonfun	3.835	Like	3.395	Better	3.532
21.	Like	3.900	Natfun	3.420	Easy	3.961
22.	Easy	3.911	Love	3.490	Like	4.035

1-Definitely my reason
2-Partly my reason
3-I'm not sure
4-Probably NOT my reason
5-Definitely NOT my reason

	SINGAPORE	MEAN	INDIA	MEAN	THAILAND	MEAN
23.	Nonwrk	3.941	Think	3.611	Nonwrk	4.036
24.	Think	4.018	Nonwrk	3.869	Love	4.176
25.	Love	4.024	Nonfun	3.898	Think	4.358

APPENDIX C

THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED ENLGISH LANGUAGE SKILLS

	SINGAPORE	MEAN	INDIA	MEAN	THAILAND	MEAN
1.	Report	1.375	Text	1.587	Takwrk	1.574
2.	Text	1.473	Report	1.722	Text	1.663
3.	Takwrk	1.716	Takwrk	1.938	Report	1.949
4.	Felwrk	1.805	Mags	2.009	Wrknon	1.990
5.	Radio	2.051	Letter	2.095	Taksoc	2.144
6.	Letter	2.059	Wrknon	2.183	Mags	2.199
7.	Mags	2.083	Taksoc	2.192	Letter	2.234
8.	Taksoc	2.095	Litfun	2.254	Taknon	2.465
9.	Felsoc	2.118	Felwrk	2.281	Radio	2.542
10.	Person	2.125	Story	2.302	Movies	2.660
11.	Wrknon	2.189	Person	2.319	Litfun	3.058
12.	Movies	2.240	Taknon	2.367	Felwrk	3.277
13.	Litfun	2.260	Radio	2.398	Story	3.478
14.	Taknon	2.424	Movie	2.409	Felsoc	3.606
15.	Story	2.435	Felsoc	2.519	Person	3.720

1-Extremely Important
2-Important
3-Neither Important Nor Unimportant
4-Unimportant
5-Extremely Unimportant

APPENDIX D

ENGLISH LANGUAGE SURVEY
EAST-WEST CENTER CULTURE LEARNING INSTITUTE

This is not a test. It has no right or wrong answers. The questions are designed to find out how you feel about English. You do not have to sign your name. Please read the questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability. Here are a few terms you may not be familiar with:

1. A NATIVE SPEAKER is a person who learns English as his first language. Most Americans, Britishers, Australians, and New Zealanders are native speakers of English.

2. A NON-NATIVE SPEAKER is a person who learns English in addition to his mother tongue. English is not his first language.

PART I: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION: (circle or write in your answer)

1. Major: English Engineering Commerce/Business (Other) _____

2. Institution: _____ 3. Future Occupation _____

4. Your age: _____ 5. Sex: Male Female

6. For how many years have you studied English? _____

7. What was the main language used in your high school? _____

8. What was the main language used in your college or university? _____

9. What languages were spoken at home when you were a child? _____
If English was spoken, what percentage of the time was it used? ____%

10. What was the first language you learned to speak? _____

11. What language do you now know the best? _____

12. What countries have you been to where you had to speak English every day? How long did you stay in each country?

COUNTRY	WEEKS	COUNTRY	WEEKS	COUNTRY	WEEKS
_____	____	_____	____	_____	____
_____	____	_____	____	_____	____

13. Did your family encourage you to study English (choose one)

____ Yes, encouraged me very much. ____ No, discouraged me a little.

____ Yes, encouraged me a little. ____ No, discouraged me very much.

____ Neither encouraged me nor discouraged me.

14. How good are you in reading, writing, speaking, and listening to English? Which can you do best? second best, etc.? Circle your answer. If you feel that you are equally good in two skills, circle the same answer for both of them.

a. READING:	My Best	Second Best	Third Best	Worst
b. WRITING:	My Best	Second Best	Third Best	Worst
c. SPEAKING:	My Best	Second Best	Third Best	Worst
d. LISTENING:	My Best	Second Best	Third Best	Worst

15. Which one of these skills do you want to be your best? _____

PART II: USE OF ENGLISH. In an average span of two months, how frequently do you speak English to the following people? Place an "X" in the appropriate space.

	NEVER	VERY RARELY	AT LEAST 1/WEEK	AT LEAST 1/DAY	MANY TIMES DAILY
16. FELLOW COUNTRYMEN:					
a. Family Members	____	____	____	____	____
b. Friends	____	____	____	____	____
c. Fellow Students	____	____	____	____	____
d. English Teachers	____	____	____	____	____
e. Other Teachers	____	____	____	____	____
f. Government Officials	____	____	____	____	____
g. Businessmen	____	____	____	____	____
h. Fellow Countrymen whose language you don't know.	____	____	____	____	____
i. (others) _____	____	____	____	____	____
j. _____	____	____	____	____	____
17. FOREIGNERS:					
k. Native Speakers of English	____	____	____	____	____
l. Other foreigners who speak English.	____	____	____	____	____

In the future, once you have graduated and taken a job, you may be using English with other people and with a different level of frequency. Please think about your future needs for English and the people with whom you think you will be using English. Place an "X" in the appropriate space for each group of people.

	NEVER	VERY RARELY	AT LEAST 1/WEEK	AT LEAST 1/DAY	MANY TIMES DAILY
18. FELLOW COUNTRYMEN:					
a. Family Members	____	____	____	____	____
b. Friends	____	____	____	____	____
c. Fellow Workers	____	____	____	____	____
d. Supervisors	____	____	____	____	____
e. Teachers	____	____	____	____	____
f. Government Officials	____	____	____	____	____
g. Businessmen	____	____	____	____	____
h. Fellow countrymen whose language you don't know	____	____	____	____	____
i. (others) _____	____	____	____	____	____
j. _____	____	____	____	____	____

	NEVER	VERY RARELY	AT LEAST 1/WEEK	AT LEAST 1/DAY	MANY TIMES DAILY
19. FOREIGNERS:					
k. Native Speakers of English.	____	____	____	____	____
l. Non-native speakers of English.	____	____	____	____	____

PART III: Reasons for Studying English. Listed below are a number of reasons why students study English. Which reasons are the same as yours? Read each reason then circle the number that best represents your real feelings. Be sure to do it for every reason.

	Definitely my reason	Partly my Reason	I'm not sure	Probably NOT MY Reason	Definitely NOT my Reason
20. I studied English because it will help me to better understand English speakers and their way of life.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I studied English because it is easy.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I studied English because I enjoy studying languages.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I studied English so that I could get a good job in my country.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I studied English so that I could get a job in a foreign country.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I studied English so I could study in a foreign country.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I studied English primarily because it is required in our system.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I studied English so I could talk to native speakers of English for business/educational reasons.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I studied English so I could talk to native speakers about general things.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I studied English so I could talk to other foreigners for business/ educational reasons.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I studied English so I could talk to other foreigners about general things.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I studied English so I could talk to people in my own country whose language is unknown to me.	1	2	3	4	5

		Definitely my reason	Partly my Reason	I'm not sure	Probably NOT my Reason	Definitely NOT my Reason
32.	I studied English because I plan to travel to a foreign country for my work.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I studied English because I plan to travel to an English-speaking country for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I studied English because I plan to travel to non-English speaking countries someday for my work.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I studied English because I want to travel to non-English speaking countries someday for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I studied English because I feel that no one is really educated until he is fluent in English.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I studied English because I will need it for my work.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	I studied English because I want to read English literature for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I studied English because I want to enjoy English films and radio and t.v. programs.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I studied English because it will help me to think and behave as English speakers do.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	I studied English because a good knowledge of it will help me get more social recognition.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	I studied English because I believe that a knowledge of another language will make me a better person.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	I studied English because I like the countries in which English is spoken.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	I studied English because I like the people who are native speakers of English.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	(other?) _____	1	2	3	4	5

46. Of all the reasons listed above, which were the three most important reasons for you? Write the numbers of these reasons here: FIRST____ SECOND____ THIRD____

PART IV: Below is a list of English language skills. How important are each of these skills to you? Answer by circling the number which shows your feeling.

HOW IMPORTANT ARE THESE ENGLISH SKILLS TO YOU?	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	NEITHER IMPORTANT NOR UNIMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	EXTREMELY UNIMPORTANT
47. Being able to talk with a native speaker of English in social situations.	1	2	3	4	5
48. Being able to talk with native speakers of English in work situations.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Being able to talk to your fellow countrymen in social situations.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Being able to talk to your fellow countrymen in work situations.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Being able to talk to non-native speakers from other countries in social situations.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Being able to talk to non-native speakers from other countries in work situations.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Being able to understand radio and t.v. broadcasts.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Being able to enjoy films in English.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Being able to read English literature for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
56. Being able to read textbooks, reports, articles, etc. in English.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Being able to read foreign newspapers, magazines, etc. in English for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Being able to write personal letters in English to foreigners.	1	2	3	4	5

		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	NEITHER IMPORTANT NOR UNIMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	EXTREMELY UNIMPORTANT
59.	Being able to write personal letters in English to fellow countrymen.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	Being able to write papers, reports, and business letters in English.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	Being able to write stories and articles etc. in English.	1	2	3	4	5

B. Of all these skills, which three are most important to you? Write the numbers of these skills here in order of importance: FIRST____ SECOND____ THIRD____.

PART V. ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH: Here are a number of statements about English. Read them carefully and then indicate if you agree or disagree with the statement by circling the number that best represents your feelings.

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
62.	In this country we have our own variety of English which is different from American, British, and Australian English.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	I believe that we should teach our own educated variety of English in our schools.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	The variety of English spoken in this country can be easily understood by foreigners.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	I believe that we should teach a native-speaker variety of English in our schools.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	I think that we should learn English without paying attention to the cultures of the English-speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	I don't really like English, but I speak it because it is useful.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	I plan to make sure that my children learn English well.	1	2	3	4	5

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
69.	In the distant future, most people in the world will know English.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	English is important only because of the political, economic and social power of the United States and Britain.	1	2	3	4	5
71.	If the United States and Britain lose their power, English will not continue to be a world language.	1	2	3	4	5
72.	If English were NOT taught in our schools, I would NOT try to learn it.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	Of all the foreign languages I could study, I like English the best.	1	2	3	4	5

74. I think that we should learn to speak English: (choose one)

_____ like the British.

_____ like the Americans.

_____ like the Australians.

_____ in our own way.

_____ like educated non-native speakers from other countries.

75. The English spoken in my country by educated speakers is generally: (choose one)

_____ like British English.

_____ like American English.

_____ like Australian English.

_____ unique to my country.

_____ like educated non-native speakers from other countries.

76. Please rank the following groups of people in order of importance to you for speaking English. Write 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the spaces to show the order of importance.

IT IS IMPORTANT FOR ME TO SPEAK ENGLISH SO THAT I CAN TALK TO:

_____ my fellow countrymen in specific social or business situations.

_____ fellow countrymen who do not know my first language.

_____ native English speakers.

_____ non-native English speakers from other countries.

77. If you had your choice, what percentage of your English class time would you spend on each of these skills? Circle the percentage number. The total must add up to 100.

	% Percentage of English Class Time										
READING:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
WRITING:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
SPEAKING:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
LISTENING:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

78. If you had your choice, what percentage of your English class time would you spend on each of these areas? Circle the percentage number. The total must add up to 100.

	% Percentage of English Class Time										
English Language Skills: (Reading, Writing, etc.)	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
English Literature:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
The Cultures of English-Speaking Countries:	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, A.S. 1977. "Re-shaping Language Policy: A New Twist to an Old Problem." Times of India. March 8.

Ackerman, Thomas J. 1972. "Teacher Attitude, Aptitude and Motivation." The ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education. 4: 35-39.

Anderson, E.I. 1970. "Developments in the Region: Thailand, The Place of English in the New Comprehensive Schools." RELC Journal. 1,2: 56-61.

Bachman, Lyle. 1975. "A Summary of Results Obtained from a Questionnaire on the Status of English at the Higher Educational Level." unpublished paper. Central Institute of English, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Brown, J. Marvin. 1976. "Thai Dominance Over English and the Learning of English by Thais." PASA. 6, 1 and 2: 67-85.

Brudhiprabha, Prapart. 1976. "Educational Policy: The Case of Thailand." PASA. 6, 1 and 2: 15-20.

Central Institute of Indian Languages. 1971. Distribution of Indian Languages in States and Union Territories. Mysore: C.I.I.L.

Chaturvedi, M.G. and B.V. Mohale. 1976. The Position of Languages in School Curriculum in India. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Cohen, Andrew D. 1974. "Mexican-American Evaluational Judgements About Language Varieties." Linguistics. 136: 33-51.

Crewe, William. 1977. The English Language in Singapore. Singapore: Eastern University Press.

Debyasuvarn, M.L. Boonlua. 1978. "Will TE/IAL Succeed Where TESL and TEFL Fail?" unpublished paper.

de Garcia, Rebecca, Sue Reynolds and Sandra Savignon. 1976. "Foreign Language Attitude Survey." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 32,3: 302-304.

Desai, M.P. 1956. Our Language Problem. Ahmedabad: Navajiwan Publishing House.

Feenstra, H.J. 1969. "Parent and Teacher Attitudes: Their Role in Second Language Acquisition." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 26,1: 5-12.

Fraser, Bruce. 1973. "Some 'Unexpected' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects" in Roger Schuy (ed.), Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Gage, William and Sirapi Ohannessian. 1977. "ESOL Enrollments Throughout the World." English Teaching Forum. July: 19-21.

Gardner, R.C. and Wallace Lambert. 1972. Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers.

_____, and P.C. Smythe. 1975. "Motivation and Second Language Learning." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 31,3: 218-230.

_____, R.E. Ginsberg and P.C. Smythe. 1976a. "Attitude and Motivation in Second Language Learning: Course Related Changes." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 32,3: 243-266.

_____, P.C. Smythe, R. Clement and L. Gliksman. 1976b. Second Language Learning: A Social Psychological Perspective." Canadian Modern Language Review. 32,3: 198-213.

Gopinathan, Saravan. 1974. Towards a National System of Education in Singapore, 1945-1973. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Hassan, Riaz (ed.). 1976. Singapore: Society in Transition. Kuala Lumpur. Oxford University Press.

Harrison, William, Clifford Prator and G. Richard Tucker. 1975. English Language Policy Survey of Jordan. Arlington. Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Hayden, Howard. 1967. Higher Education and Development in South-east Asia, Vol. II: Country Profiles. Paris: Unesco.

Joiner, Elizabeth. 1974. "Tailoring Language Instruction to Student Needs." The ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education. 6: 151-184.

Kachru, Braj. 1969. "English in South Asia." in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) Current Trends in Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

_____, 1976. "Models of English for the Third World: White Man's Linguistic Burden or Language Pragmatics." TESOL Quarterly. 10,2: 221-239.

_____, 1977. "The New Englishes and Old Models." English Teaching Forum. July: 29-35.

Kubchandani, Lachman M. 1976. "English as a Contact Language in South Asia." RELC Journal. 7,1: 21-30.

Kuo, Eddie C.Y. 1974. "Language Status and Literary Trend in a Multilingual Society." RELC Journal. 5,1: 1-15

_____, 1976. "A Sociolinguistic Analysis of English as a Non-Native Dominant Language in Singapore." unpublished paper. University of Singapore.

Lee Kuan Yew. 1977a. Text of Address on Higher Education and Singapore's Future. The Straits Times. Dec. 29.

_____, 1977b. Text of Question and Answer Session Following Prime Minister's Address to the Political Association of the Univeristy of Singapore. The Straits Times. Dec. 31.

Lee Sow Ling. 1974. A Survey of the English Language Teaching Situation in the SEAMEO Countries: Phase I: Country Profiles. Singapore: Regional Language Centre,

Lester, Mark. 1977. "English as an International Auxiliary Language." unpublished paper for the Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center.

Lipton, Gladys. 1972. "Curricula for New Goals." The ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education. 4: 187-218.

Lukmani, Yasmeen. 1972. "Motivation to Learn and Language Proficiency." Language Learning. 22: 261-275.

Macnamara, John. 1973. "Attitudes and Learning a Second Language." in Roger W. Schuy (ed.) Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Ministry of Education. 1967. The Study of English: Report of a Study Group Appointed by the Ministry of Education. No. 810. New Delhi: Government of India.

_____, 1968. National Policy on Education 1968. No. 832. New Delhi: Government of India.

_____, 1971. Report of the Study Group on the Teaching of English. New Delhi: Government of India.

_____, 1977. National Education Policy of Thailand, 1977. unofficial translation. private communication from Mayuri Sukwiwat.

Narayan, Satyendra. 1970. Marxism and the Language Problem in India. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.

Nigam, R.C. 1972. Language Handbook on Mother Tongues in the Census of India, 1971. New Delhi: Office of the Registrar General.

Niyogi, Niranjan. 1965. National Integration and the Language Problem. Calcutta: East Bengal Press.

Noss, Richard. 1967. Higher Education and Development in South-east Asia, Vol. III, Part II: Language Policy. Paris: Unesco.

Papalia, Anthony. 1973. "An Assessment of Attitudes and Behaviors of Foreign Language Teachers." Foreign Language Annals. 7,2: 231-236.

Platt, John T. 1975. "The Singapore Speech Continuum and Its Basilect 'Singlish' as a Creoloid." Anthropological Linguistics. 17,7: 363-374.

Prator, Clifford. 1968. "The British Heresy in TEFL." In Joshua Fishman et al. (eds.), Language Problems in Developing Nations. New York: Wiley.

Reinert, Harry. 1970. "Student Attitudes Towards Foreign Language--No Sale!" The Modern Language Journal. 54,2: 107-112.

Ryan, Ellen Bouchard. 1973. "Subjective Reactions Toward Accented Speech" in Roger W. Schuy (ed.), Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Santos, Emma. 1968. "A Study of the Roles of Aptitude, Attitude and Motivation in Second Language Acquisition." unpublished masters thesis. Philippine Normal College.

Savignon, Sandra J. 1976. "On the Other Side of the Desk: A Look at Teacher Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 32,3: 295-302.

Shastri, P.D. 1977. "Linguistic Fanaticism Again." Times of India. May 7.

Smith, Larry. 1976. "English as an International Auxiliary Language." RELC Journal. 7,2: 57-63.

Smith, Larry (comp). 1970-1977. "ESL: State of the Art." unpublished papers for the Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center.

Sommer, Tamara. 1974. "Culture in Foreign Language Teaching." The Canadian Modern Language Review. 30,4: 342-346.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1969. "Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning." Language Learning. 19,3: 271-283.

Tongue, Ray K. 1974. The English of Singapore and Malaysia. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Wangsotorn, Achara. 1976. "Relationships Between Student Background and Motivation Toward Achievement in English." PASA. 6, 1 and 2: 211-224.

Watson, Karen and P.W.J. Nababan. 1975. "Papers on the Sociolinguistic Situations in SEAMEO Countries." unpublished paper for the Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center and Regional Language Centre, Singapore.